American Literature Moves On—*Mary Austin*

The World Tomorrow

Twenty-five Cents a Copy — Two Dollars a Year

Vol. X. — DECEMBER, 1927 — No. 12

The First Fine Careless Rapture
Halford E. Luccock

Bogies — *Art Young*

Why Barnum Was Right
Goodwin Watson

Dreaming True
John Haynes Holmes

Catholics, Protestants, Mexicans
Hubert C. Herring

The World Tomorrow, Inc.

52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Are We Approaching a Crisis in The Dawes Plan?

KIRBY PAGE, editor of this journal, has written a well balanced book, *Dollars and World Peace,* in which he examines Nationalism, Industrialism and Imperialism. Part V of this volume is devoted to a careful consideration of The War Debts.

William P. Merrill, Minister, Brick Presbyterian Church, New York, and Chairman, World Alliance for Friendship Through the Churches, writes:

> I have just read your "Dollars and World Peace." Please let me thank you with all my heart. It is a notable example of what we need,—high idealism that is generous to others' views and sound in reasoning. In my opinion it is the best yet, on Intervention, Outlawry of War, Interallied Debts, especially the last.

E. C. CARTER: *The Inquiry:*

> "You have got together an amazing collection of material and a vivid thread of interpretation in 'Dollars and World Peace.' Someone remarked that it was one-sided. This may be true but it is not as one-sided as the consistent policy of the Saturday Evening Post."

The next six months will bring an effort to make the Dawes Plan work. There will be discussion of War Debts on all sides. You will need to understand this world problem. Mr. Page's book will help you. The book and THE WORLD TOMORROW together in a combination offered at the price of a year's subscription to the magazine. In other words a cloth bound volume (regular $1.50 edition) and a year's subscription to THE WORLD TOMORROW, BOTH for $2.00, if you use the coupon at the bottom of the next page.

IN a new book, *Religion and Social Justice,* Sherwood Eddy attacks the four big realms of difficulty in our modern civilization. He brings new light and experience to our Economic, Racial, International and Religious problems. His book is being widely read and discussed. You can get a copy of the regular cloth bound edition with a year's subscription to THE WORLD TOMORROW, BOTH for $2.25.

Other Books and Their Prices

THE WORLD TOMORROW	Regular Price	Both for
with The Rise of American Civilization, by Charles and Mary Beard	$14.50	$10.50
with The Story of Philosophy, by Will Durant.	7.00	5.00
with Brother John, by Vida Scudder	4.50	3.50
with God's Trombones, by James Weldon Johnson	4.50	3.50
with Outlawry of War, by C. C. Morrison	5.00	4.00

THE WORLD TOMORROW	Regular Price	Both for
with The Nation	$7.00	$5.50
with Harper's	6.00	5.00
with The Christian Century	6.00	3.50
(Special offer for new subscribers to the Christian Century; no renewals to that journal accepted.)		
with Crisis	3.50	2.75
with The Atlantic Monthly	6.00	4.75
with St. Nicholas	5.50	4.25
with Opportunity	3.50	2.75
with Children	4.50	3.00
with The New Republic	7.00	5.50
with The Bookman	6.00	4.50
with Foreign Affairs	7.00	6.25

Use the Coupon on the next page →

Progress with the Progressives

"TIME STAYS: WE GO" is the title of the Fountain of Time, a sculptured group by Lorado Taft in one of the parks in Chicago. Shall we go the way of Chicago with "Bill, the Builder," or shall we go in the vanguard in matters of war, international relations, economics, and race relations? We invite you to go with the progressives in THE WORLD TOMORROW.

Will Outlawing War Stop Wars?

IN this issue a group of leaders in the peace movements and churches have contributed to a symposium "All about Outlawry." You ought to read this discussion.

WILLIAM E. BORAH

In the immediate future, in THE WORLD TOMORROW, Senator William E. Borah will discuss "The Outlawry of War." A subscription to this journal will assure your seeing this significant article.

And These Others

Building Tomorrow's World.....Maude Royden
Recent Gains in International Relations.....Norman Thomas
Where Farmers and Labor Cooperate.....J. E. Kirkpatrick
The Family Wage System.....Paul H. Douglas
Gains in Race Relations.....Charles S. Johnson
The Future of Christian Missions.....J. H. Oldham
Why Christian Missions?.....Sherwood Eddy
The Oriental Versus the Occidental Strategy of Life,
Reinhold Niebuhr

How to Send Your Christmas Gifts

IN order to facilitate the task of selecting the family magazines and books for the year we have compiled the list on the opposite page and have arranged some remarkable combination offers that will stretch the budget to include many more than you had thought possible. We will gladly handle renewals for you and enter these and new subscriptions for as many addresses as you send us. We will announce your gifts for you with an attractive card.

Special Introductory Offer to New Subscribers
THE WORLD TOMORROW for 8 Months for $1.00

THE WORLD TOMORROW, Inc., 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York City.

Please enter my subscription for one year. (I enclose $2.00, Canada, $2.25, Foreign $2.50.)
or rather

I am interested in your joint offer of.....for $..... Send these to the addresses given below.
and

Send your 8 month introductory subscription for the $1.00 enclosed to

Name .....Street .....City and State.....

(On joint Magazine Subscriptions for Canada add 50c to prices given; foreign $1.00)

(If we did not give you enough space on this blank, just attach a slip of paper telling us what you want.)

The
World Tomorrow

Vol. X December, 1927 No. 12

Copyright 1927
The World Tomorrow, Inc.

CONTENTS

PAGE

Cover Sketch. Art Young (Reprinted with Permission from Boni and Liveright from "Trees at Night")
Editorials — 485
The First Fine Careless Rapture. By Halford E. Luccock — 488
His Cross (Verse). By Marguerite Wilkinson — 491
Why Barnum Was Right. By Goodwin B. Watson — 492
In Defense of Shams and Myths. By E. W. Houlding — 494
The Myth of Military Security. By Emily Greene Balch — 496
Dreaming True. By John Haynes Holmes — 498
Lovers of Men (Verse). By Philip Gray — 500
Prayers (Verse). By Arthur R. Macdougall, Jr — 500
Not in the Headlines. By Agnes A. Sharp — 501
American Literature Moves On. By Mary Austin — 502
All About Outlawry (A symposium). — 506
Findings — 509
Monuments. By Howard Becker — 510
The Eagle (Verse). By Leon Srabian Herald — 511
Fog Horns (Verse). By Herbert S. Gorman — 511
Catholics, Protestants, Mexicans. By Hubert C. Herring — 512
Pacific Sunset (Verse). By H. Thompson Rich — 515
Shadow of Earth (Verse). By E. Merrill Root — 515
Two Men With Good Cases. By Douglas Haskell — 516
Clippings — 518
The Book End — 519
Correspondence — 524
The Last Page — 526

The Point of View

WE hope that all our readers will examine carefully the opening article in this number, in which Halford E. Luccock challenges the Church to recover the divine carelessness of its early triumphant days. In the effort to save its life—that is, its property, budget, popularity, prestige—the Church is in danger of losing its transforming power. The wisdom of the Great Teacher is being revealed in this age as in previous ones: the only way to gain life is to fling it away in glorious abandon.

Four contributions in this issue deal with myths and shams. Why are people so easily deluded? How does it happen that intelligent men and women are so gullible as to swallow without verification the slanderous charges against respectable citizens contained in anonymously circulated documents? How can one distinguish between myths and ideals?

We are printing herein a number of comments on the Outlawry of War. Some of our readers seem to have been greatly distressed over the sharp differences of opinion revealed by the two articles on Outlawry in our last issues.

These comments give us a good excuse to emphasize again the strategy which we have adopted for this journal. Our supreme effort is to stimulate thought that will lead to intelligent and courageous action. To this end we publish varying points of view in the hope of arriving nearer the truth. We are not interested in making up our readers' minds for them. Our desire is rather to furnish a basis for more intelligent decisions on the part of our constituency.

NOW for a word about our contributors in this number. **Mary Austin** is the author of numerous books and a contributor to many leading periodicals. Her article is the third in our series on Recent Gains in American Civilization. **Halford E. Luccock,** is a special contributing editor of the chain of Christian Advocates across the country. It is doubtful if the voice of any other Methodist carries further or stimulates more vigorously than that of Hal Luccock. **Goodwin B. Watson,** is instructor in Educational Psychology, Teachers' College, Columbia University, and possesses insight rare in one of his years—for if the truth must be told he is only a youngster. **E. W. Houlding,** until recently was a missionary under the American Board in China. **Emily Green Balch** is a professor at Wellesley and has long been active in the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. **John Haynes Holmes** needs no introduction to our readers. As pastor of The Community Church of New York City and an active participant in a score of good causes, he is a high exemplar of the idealism about which he writes. **Hubert C. Herring,** Secretary of the Commission of Social Relations of the Congregational Churches, has first hand knowledge of conditions in Mexico and is a religious liberal of the most cooperative brand. **Howard C. Becker** studied for a year in Germany after graduating from Northwestern. **Douglas Haskell** is a former editor of The New Student. **Lucy Mason** is Secretary of the Y. W. C. A. in Richmond, Virginia.

The drawing on our cover this month is one by **Art Young** taken from a new portfolio of his work entitled Trees at Night, just published by Boni and Liveright.

THE WORLD TOMORROW

Published monthly at 52 VANDERBILT AVENUE, NEW YORK, *by* THE WORLD TOMORROW, INC.

KIRBY PAGE, *Editor* — DEVERE ALLEN, *Literary Editor* — AGNES A. SHARP, *Managing Editor*
JOHN NEVIN SAYRE, *President* — KENNETH E. WALSER, *Treasurer*

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Sarah N. Cleghorn, Paul H. Douglas, Sherwood Eddy, H. C. Engelbrecht, Zona Gale, John Haynes Holmes, Paul Jones, Rufus M. Jones, A. J. Muste, Reinhold Niebuhr, Richard Roberts, Anna Rochester, Norman Thomas, Harry F. Ward.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL: Contributing Editors and Leslie Blanchard, Samuel M. Cavert, Amy Blanche Greene, Douglas Haskell, Charles S. Johnson, F. Ernest Johnson, Joshua Lieberman, David R. Porter, John Nevin Sayre, Ridgley Torrence, Henry P. Van Dusen.

FOREIGN CORRESPONDENTS: A. Maude Royden (England); Arnold Wolfers (Germany); Henry T. Hodgkin (China); C. F. Andrews (India). Correspondents in other countries will be added.

Vera Kelsey, Editorial Assistant; Mary Anne Phillips, Editorial Secretary;
Lucyle Hook, Business Assistant; Viola Falmetta, Subscription Manager; Lillie Becker, Bookkeeper.

THE WORLD TOMORROW is published on the first of the month. Single copies, 25 cents; $2 per year; Canada, $2.25; foreign, $2.50. Orders for copies, subscriptions and all correspondence should be sent to THE WORLD TOMORROW, 52 Vanderbilt Ave., New York City. London representative, Edgar Dunstan, 11 Lincoln's Inn Fields, London. Annual Subscription, 10s. post free. Entered as Second Class Matter, Sept. 30, 1926, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

The World Tomorrow

A Journal Looking Toward a Social Order Based on the Religion of Jesus

Vol. X. December, 1927 No. 12

Editorials

Peace at Any Price

The program committee had been authorized to secure a speaker for Armistice Day. The choice of the committee fell on an individual who was known as a pacifist. He was already engaged. The person next invited held similar views. He accepted. When the announcement of his coming was made, the storm broke. The American Legion, the Ladies Auxiliary of the Legion, and the Daughters of the American Revolution lifted their voices to high heaven. The local press expressed righteous indignation. The Lions Club threatened to secede from the celebration. An ominous crisis hovered. A meeting of the general committee was called. A member of the program committee, an individual of liberal tendencies and anything but a militarist, made a speech. He deplored dissension. Why talk of world peace if a local memorial celebration is to degenerate into a riot? In order that domestic peace be preserved, it seemed wise to substitute a more acceptable speaker. He so moved. War was averted.

In one form or another this scene is being repeated in hundreds of American communities. Frequently the storm of protest precedes and prevents invitations from being extended to persons who are unequivocally opposed to war as a means of maintaining security and justice. There are scores and scores of colleges in this country where pacifists are barred from speaking. Various patriotic organizations are seeking to prevent such persons from getting a hearing on any platform. Five or six national organizations are now specializing in slanderous attacks upon pacifist and semi-pacifist speakers. These attacks are becoming more frequent and more vicious.

What is a local committee to do? Or a pastor or a college president? Is freedom of speech on the vital theme of war sufficiently important to justify local dissension? Or shall we yield to pressure and intimidation? Shall we have peace at any price?

Pacifism—"Bound to Divide"

The Herald of Gospel Liberty is a liberal, well-edited paper. In its issue of October 13 this journal expressed very frankly a certain view of pacifism which is far from rare.

In speaking of *Building International Goodwill,* a collection of papers prepared under the auspices of the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, it says: "Happily it leaves out altogether the advocacy of pacifism, which has been a serious defect in some of our other textbooks against war; for any discussion of pacifism is bound to divide the forces, even the Christian forces, and put into the hands of the militarists their most effective club against peace advocates and the cause of world peace in general." And a little later on appears this further wisdom: "Not until the people themselves are moved with a far more profound conviction and passion for peace than they yet have, and not until they are far more deeply bulwarked with a faith in its possibility and workability than yet moves them, can we hope to see actual world peace. Now the promotion of such understanding and faith is the task and responsibility of the churches and followers of Jesus Christ everywhere. And this can best be done by avoiding divisive discussions of methods and pacifism and all that, and centering upon the deeper and more primary principles and spirit which must visé any methods or any technique in order to make them effective."

Another proponent of the same view, it would seem, is the *Advocate of Peace,* organ of the American Peace Society, which raises, in its November issue, the question of whether "radicals" should be invited to participate in its centennial celebration next spring. "Such a conference should be," it declares, "not so much a display of half-baked opinions as a historical and scientific exposition of international friendliness and cooperation." It will be hard, one fears, for the American Peace Society to be truly historical; for its

founder, William Ladd, became so radical that eventually he renounced even defensive war. David Low Dodge, the originator of the peace movement, was a non-resistant, even, and remained so throughout his lifetime, during most of which he was a director of the A. P. S. Joseph John Gurney, Elihu Burritt, and a host of others were radical pacifists, though the latter in 1846, along with the American Peace Society's president, Samuel E. Coues, and a half-dozen other leaders resigned from the Society because of a threatened weakening in the radical anti-all-war clause that was attached to the constitution in 1837. This change, though postponed, has of course been made, until the A. P. S. in 1921 boasted (though with only a 50% accuracy, as it happens) that it had supported the government in every war of our history for the past one hundred years. Clearly, the best thing for the A. P. S. to do now is to eschew history and like many another hoary institution, keep itself uncontaminated by contact with disturbers.

As for pacifism, that pestilential faith has driven men and women over the seven seas in service to the cause of brotherhood at the risk of their lives. For some of its adherents, it has compelled renunciation of wealth and privilege; to some it has meant sacrificial and effective devotion to inter-racial goodwill at dangerous points of conflict; for many hundreds of years it has been the power which gave men, as for example, William Penn, an idealistic approach to concrete problems from which eventuated incontestibly wise solutions. To all it has meant a way of living, one part of which has been the total repudiation of war as a means of resolving differences, in favor of more practical methods.

But none the less, the arguments of our contemporaries move us. We are about ready to stop promoting or discussing pacifism—and all that—entirely. It divides. It gives the proponents and defenders of war something to criticise in the peace movement. It weakens the sections of that peace movement itself when its leaders seek to convince their opponents that there is nothing to worry about in peace work.

The aim of all good workers for peace should be to make it as painless as possible to those who are not won to it already. We are after peace; and what is to be gained by the discussion of methods? Just make a declaration of common purpose so simple that all can agree on it and get busy. And why not go further still, while we are so repentant? There was once a rather radical young man who made himself *persona non grata* in religious circles because of his divisive influence. He not only lived his kind of life, but he lived it not all in quiet, nor unobtrusively. He urged his followers to let their light shine before all men; and he even went so far as to declare that he was sent, not to bring peace, but division. Here and there, although strenuous efforts have been made against it, his prophetic influence has made its way even into the churches which bear his name. It seems as challenging and divisive as ever. We are confident that through discretion, the dissension among Christians which inevitably follows any consideration of his methods and technique can be prevented, and not be permitted to hold Christians back from undivided efforts toward a warless world.

Honesty compels us to state that we had thought of pacifism as a method in tune with religious ideals and the practical working out of social and natural laws. We had even dared to believe that unity and fellowship could be achieved in the world better by this than by any other method.

Not so, it seems. Those who so believe are but divisive. Conservative peace efforts are not divisive. Work for "the whole question of peace" is not divisive. But pacifism is divisive; and anything divisive had better be ruled out. It is not divisive, however, when non-pacifists leave out pacifism, nor divisive when pacifists labor for everything else but. It is divisive when anybody, pacifists or otherwise, consider pacifism. The future of peace rests solely with those whose tolerance of war is such that they are able to take it or leave it alone.

Thus we shall have to subside. Not talk about pacifism. Not think pacifism. Not do anything for pacifism. Our pores shall perspire hereafter only for the non-divisive varieties of peace tactics; that "sane and reasonable" kind, as our friend the editor of the *Herald* suggests, to which "not even a rational militarist himself could object."

Turkey Wins

Six to five. France got the five. The vote of the judges of the Permanent Court of International Justice in the LOTUS case sheds light on the question as to whether a small power can get justice against a great power, and also as to whether a non-member of the League can obtain a square deal in an international tribunal. The LOTUS, a French steamer, collided with a Turkish collier in the Aegean Sea on August 2, 1926. A French officer of the LOTUS was arrested and tried in a Turkish court, fined and imprisoned. The French government protested. The Permanent Court was asked to decide whether the Turkish Government had violated international law in instituting criminal proceedings against the French officer. Its decision was in the negative. While the judges of the Permanent Court do not sit as representatives of their respective nations, it is interesting to note that the following nationalities were represented in the votes for Turkey: Italy, Japan, Brazil, Switzerland, Cuba, Turkey.

Boring from Within

The heresy-hunters should do something about it. The *New York Times* has gone Bolshevik. At least its subsidiary *Current History* has. Eighty-four pages of the last issue are devoted to Russia. That fact in itself is sufficient to create suspicion. This number contains articles by Bolsheviks in defense of their wickedness. Then there are long eulogies by renegade Americans. High praise is given to many of the communist leaders for their ability and devotion. Statistics are quoted showing steady economic advancement during the past five years. Of course, there are a number of articles by writers who are hostile to the Bolsheviks, but these are doubtless a mere smoke screen. The situation is really serious. Remember that this periodical is found in all the leading libraries. It can be bought at any newsstand. The youth of the land are certain to be contaminated. Henceforth the editor of *Current History* will be under surveillance, and it may be discovered that his salary comes straight from Moscow.

Censorship for Foreign Loans

Senator Carter Glass, of Virginia, former Secretary of the Treasury, has done us a service by calling attention to the fact that the State Department is still continuing a policy inaugurated in the Harding Administration of examining all foreign loans by American investors. Secretary Hughes in laying down this policy was very careful to insist that in passing on foreign loans the government did not endorse them or promise to collect them but that "the [State] Department believes that in view of the possible national interests involved it should have the opportunity of saying to the underwriters concerned, should it appear advisable to do so, that there is or is not objection to any particular loan."

In effect Senator Glass defends the right of Wall Street to lend money when and where it pleases. Government endorsement, he feels, gives an unwarranted privileged position to foreign loans. President Coolidge in reply finally took a position somewhat less cautious than that originally laid down by Secretary Hughes. Not only did he say that the floatation of foreign loans is "one element of foreign relations" but also he argued that unless the State Department exercised some supervision "Congress might enact a drastic regulatory law which in the end might interfere with the making of any such loan," a line of reasoning irritating to gentlemen sensitive of Congressional prerogatives.

Unfortunately neither Senator Glass nor anybody else has really gone to the root of the matter. That root is economic imperialism. Do you believe that it is the business of a government vigorously and effectively to back up the interests of its investors abroad, even if necessary by the use of force? If so, at the very least the government should have the right to supervise these investments to the extent proposed by Secretary Hughes, and that right should be more vigilantly and consistently exercised than by the present State Department. On the other hand if you do not believe that the collection of private debts abroad is the function of our government, not for one minute will it be enough to say with Senator Glass that the censorship of loans is improper. The fundamental weakness of the Senator's position is that he does not go far enough. He belonged to an administration which vigorously practiced intervention fundamentally in behalf of property rights in Santo Domingo and Haiti. He has always supported in the Senate an aggressive foreign policy. Unless he is willing to say positively and explicitly that in no way can foreign investments involve our foreign policy or lead us to risk blood and treasure in the collection of private debts his support of uncensored loans is, if possible, even more dangerous than Secretary Kellogg's blundering censorship. We are not primarily interested in Wall Street's rights in the matter or even the constitutional law of the situation. We ordinary citizens have an immense concern in this discussion of the censorship of loans for the light it may shed on that policy of economic imperialism which is the fruitful mother of war.

The "Killing Test" for Citizenship

During the War a writer in *The Hibbert Journal* made the point that the true test of loyalty was not the willingness of a person to die for a cause, but his readiness to kill for a cause. Federal Judge Carpenter of Chicago has apparently accepted that dictum of war hysteria as common law, for he has recently refused naturalization papers to Mme. Rosika Schwimmer because she declared she was unwilling to kill even in self-defense. It is not the first time that such a disgraceful decision has been rendered, for Federal Judge Wolverton of Portland, Ore., denied citizenship to Mary King, a Quaker, in 1924 on the same grounds and several men in Indiana who had similar convictions were refused citizenship there. Yet there is no possible ground in law for such action, for the Federal Government grants passports to citizens who explain that they are not ready to swear that they will support the Constitution by force of arms. It is to be hoped that the decision will be tested and reversed by the higher courts. The homicide rate in the United States is already far too high to have it fostered by such a prejudiced process of selection.

Building Tomorrow's World

"The First Fine Careless Rapture"

"That's the wise thrush; he sings each song twice over
Lest you should think he never could recapture
The first, fine, careless rapture."

A MUCH worn quotation, no doubt. Yet it would be hard to think of anything closer to the center of that much discussed question, Can Christianity demonstrate its moral power in this generation.

Whether Christianity can be adequate to the moral leadership of our civilization today and tomorrow depends on whether it can recapture that "first, fine, careless rapture" of its earliest days, for that is the thing so conspicuously missing over large areas of church life today. The churches have numbers, wealth, position, efficiency of many sorts; but anything resembling New Testament rapture, and the divine carelessness from which it came, is almost as hard to find as lost youth.

There is not much hope of recovering that mood and the power which it generated without knowing rather clearly where it came from.

One of the most striking differences between a large section of the Church today and the Christian fellowship pictured in the New Testament, is that the New Testament Church was *fighting something.* All through the New Testament, particularly in the latter part of it, when the shadow of persecution and martyrdom began to fall on the little Christian group, there is an oppressive sense of a desperate conflict, a fight to the death with malignant and powerful forces of evil. One of the suggestive translations which Professor Goodspeed has made of Paul's words is: "We struggle against the ruling spirits of this dark age." The Church in the New Testament never thought of itself as being in a rest camp; it was obviously on a battle line. Some of the characteristic marks of the life reflected in the New Testament are due precisely to the experience of relentless battle with the ruling and malignant forces of evil in the world. For in that life of the early Church we find an exhilaration of spirit, an intensity of fellowship, a moral energy that we can still feel in the New Testament like the throbbing of a great dynamo. There is a buoyancy and an unhesitating faith. All these combined to make that Christianity a tremendous moral power.

THE vitality of first century Christianity was a product and a fruit of certain attitudes and actions. It was not a thing by itself. The rapid beating of a person's heart is the result of exertion. One cannot say, "Go to now, I will have my heart beat fast." Our hearts beat fast only when we do something to make them beat fast. In a very true sense the quick beating of the heart of the New Testament Church was in part a product of a life and death struggle with monstrous forces of evil, during which the Church often looked closely into the bright face of danger.

The supreme instance of this truth is found in the Book of Revelation. That book is a dark forest but it is lighted by many bivouac fires. There can be no question but that we find in Revelation two things—first, a terrific battle with the evil order in the world roundabout, and second, the most intense and joyful fellowship, the most heightened exhilaration made up of faith and courage, of which literature preserves any record. It is contended here that the union of these two things is not accidental. They depend upon one another. They are always found together. If we are to recover the vitality and rapture of the New Testament experience we must recover the New Testament fight.

The most vivid picture of this is found in the imagery of the Beast in the Book of Revelation. It is a tradition that the passages about the beast have been the happy hunting grounds of Biblical literalists and fanatics who have fastened the most weird and fantastic interpretations on that much-interpreted animal. Yet the imagery is very simple. It was readily understood by those to whom the Book was addressed. The Beast was Rome; it was a succession of emperors, "a wild beast with ten horns and seven heads rising out of the sea." The imagery, of course, is from the

Book of Daniel. This beast does the bidding of Satan, "who gave it his power, his throne and wide dominion." (Rev. 13: 1-2.) Rome is Babylon the great, "the mother of harlots, drunk with the blood of martyrs." [Rev. 17: 5-6.)

The Christian fellowship was locked in deadly conflict with the great exploiting power of its time, that cruel, well-nigh omnipotent power which devoured and mangled the lives of men. The Christians were never deluded into thinking that they could make an easy compromise with such an evil power. They did not compliment it. They heaped upon it the ugliest and most shameful names of human speech. They did not attempt to shake hands with it in a hail-fellow-well-met jocular manner. That came later in the days of Constantine and then the glory departed and the Church accepted the manacles of slavery.

The point which we are emphasizing here is that a large part of that intensity and vividness of spiritual experience and power manifested in the New Testament came because those Christians were fighting the Beast. There is always a special blessing—an intensity and richness which comes to those who fight the Beast. By the Beast we do not mean a constituted authority. The Christian struggle in the first three centuries was not against government as such. It was against that crushing, mangling force which spoiled and destroyed life. The equivalent of the beast in our day is that brute force animated by the motive of profit, whether it is in the war system, which gorges itself on flesh and blood, or on a rampant industrialism which fattens on the same human diet.

Whoever fights the Beast has a special blessing. We are here reminded of the old conception of what was called the Second Blessing, a depth and height of Christian experience which went beyond the elementary experience of conventional discipleship. That idea of the Second Blessing has been accompanied with much undisciplined emotionalism and fanaticism but it had this one great value among others, that it testified to a dissatisfaction with commonplace and conventional religion.

THE Second Blessing which the Church must get if it is to maintain and recover its allurement and power, is the blessing that comes to those who wage a thorough-going battle with the exploiting powers of evil in our time. The truth that there is such a blessing can be discovered in any company of people who have set themselves to battle desperately for what they consider their liberty, or to right what they consider injury. Take the average socialist and communist group for instance. Disagree as we may with their goals, with their motives, or with their methods, we cannot but admit that in such a struggling fellowship, when the battle is on, there is an intensity and vividness of life which puts the average Christian congregation to shame. To go from an average Sunday evening church service, where a small company of people are decorously and drowsily going through a routine, into a protest meeting of working men, is like going from a cemetery to a three-alarm fire. The difference is largely because the protesting group has the blessing of an intensified life which is the reward of the fighter. The sluggish group in the church is not fighting anything particularly. The other group, in its own consciousness at least, is not only fighting for itself but for the world's future.

THE future of Christianity depends on our recovery of that sense of the vivid reality of religion. That in turn depends on our facing and fighting in an uncalculating, reckless spirit the master iniquities of our age, which deny by their very existence the Gospel of Jesus. The New Testament experience is lacking because over such wide areas in our Church life there is so little fight. Ecclesiastical life has consisted so much, as Canon Woods has said: "In the uninspiring spectable of a docile and mild-mannered gentleman trying to persuade a docile company of people to be still more docile." So many of our churches do not know that there is any fight going on. They are like the lady in London over a hundred years old, who went through all the years of the Great War with Zepplins dropping bombs over her very head, without knowing a single thing about it. Her family not wishing to distress her unnecessarily kept her in entire ignorance that a war was going on.

The weakness of the Church today is that people who ought to be fighting forces, struggling against social wrongs, are not so much fighters as they are dear old ladies in snowy white caps, sitting in rocking chairs, not knowing that there is any fight going on. One of the chief differences in the Church of our age and that of the Book of Revelation is that instead of fighting the Beast we stroke it and pet it and say, "Nice pussy!" We compliment it on its fur and feel flattered when it lifts a paw to shake hands with us in response to some address of salutation.

Often ministers and churches stultify themselves in their pious approval of pirates of the industrial world. They take positions quite incompatible with the implications of their Gospel. If anyone thinks this last statement is exaggerated, let him read the eulogy delivered by a prominent minister at a memorial service held in Washington, in honor of the late Judge Gary, in which it was solemnly declared by this representative of Christ that what America needed most was more men like this man. If that eulogy had been intended to cover merely the fine personal record of a high moral standard of private conduct it would have been quite fitting. But it was spread out as a tribute

to the social accomplishments of the man—a man who led to the last ditch the fight for the twelve-hour day and the seven-day week; who stood for squeezing the life and soul out of men for the sake of biggest profits!

A long time ago Ralph Waldo Emerson said keenly that the real object of worship of many Christians of his day was represented by the best diagonal line which could be drawn between Abbott Lawrence and Jesus Christ. Abbott Lawrence was probably the most conspicuous industrial Baron of his time. He embodied those sacred qualities of New England shrewdness and the ability to make two dollars grow where only one grew before. Our worship today still moves along the same kind of diagonal lines. Some people draw their diagonal line between Napoleon and Jesus Christ, and accept the best resulting compromise that comes out. Others favor the diagonal line which represents the compromise effected between the far more potent financial King and the peasant of Galilee.

By this process we bleach all the color out of Jesus. Our life and words lacks sting. The anti-climax which is the inevitable doom following such diagonal manipulations is very keenly described with unconscious satire in an entry in the Journal of Samuel Pepys: "A good sermon of Mr. Gifford at our church upon 'Seek ye first the kingdom of heaven'. A very excellent and persuasive, a good and moral sermon. *He showed like a wise man that righteousness is a surer moral way of being rich than sin.*"

O lovely Gospel!

On this entry Robert Louis Stevenson comments: "It is thus that the respectable people desire their Great hearts to address them, telling in mild accents how you may make the best of both worlds and be a moral hero without courage, kindness, or troublesome reflections and thus the Gospel, cleared of eastern metaphor, becomes a model of worldly prudence and a handy book for Pepys and the successful merchant."

Is not one of the major reasons for the absorption of so many ministers and churches in the petty and fussy details of ecclesiasticism, the fact that there is no headlong fighting going on between them and the entrenched evils of the social order? Consequently, the first fine, careless rapture is gone, so they take up a preoccupation with ecclesiasticism as a compensation or a defense mechanism. Thus the Church of St. Peter becomes the Church of St. Vitus, a fearful degeneration in which the headlong impetuosity of a prophet and fighter is replaced by the insignificant ups and downs of a parochial merry-go-round.

THE heart of the matter—and nothing in the world effects more vitally the future of the Christian Church—is that so easily the church can become involved in the established order of things in the social and economic world, that it finds any kind of effective protest against the evils of that system increasingly difficult. It is not because the church has made any conscious surrender of its principles but by a very natural and insidious process it depends so on wealth and the established order for its support that it becomes part of the very thing it should struggle against.

Sometimes it seems as though the churches have read their New Testament in this way, "A new commandment I give unto thee, *Thou shalt not upset the apple cart.*" These words fairly express the unconscious fears and timidities of many a congregation. It expresses the sense of a never-forgotten obligation to refrain from collision with current economic traditions and practices and with financial powers behind those practices.

Sometimes the elevation of this commandment to a place of first importance is due merely to an affinity on the part of many in the church for the good, the true, the beautiful (and the prosperous!).

Sometimes, however, the bonds which unite the church to the powers that be in the economic world are of a firmer nature. The church must go on. Its overhead runs twenty-four hours a day and each year seems to see an increase in the amount of overhead that must be kept running. The underlying philosophy is not very different from that piece of distilled prudence, "Don't bite the hand that feeds you." There is nothing so crude or simple as a deliberate betrayal of the gospel or cowardice in its presentation. The situation is far more complex and subtle and complicated than that.

But like the pressure of the atmosphere of fifteen pounds to the square inch on all of us, there is the ever-present pressure of the ruling ideas of the masters of the economic and business world and the situation of the church itself. That situation is complicated in thousands of instances by the fact that the church has given large hostages to the business world to further a building program. Millions of dollars of mortgages are held over churches. There are unpaid pledges of other millions of dollars. It is for the temporal interest of the church to avoid any disturbance in the placid calm of business prosperity. It is not to be wondered at that the first concern of a large number of trustees and other officials is for carrying through their venture successfully.

Hence, there is a very strong feeling to this effect: "There is no use of us or our minister being quixotic. We can very well postpone playing on some notes of the Christian Gospel until a more convenient season. Prudence is the better part of valor. *Don't upset the apple cart.*"

We do not believe that anyone has yet seriously estimated the consequences of the prodigious exploits in church building in the last few years. Last year more

than $600,000,000 was expended in the erection of church buildings. That undoubtedly represents spiritual assets but it also represents appalling spiritual liabilities.

The result often is such an increase in prudence that the church's lips are sealed even in the presence of glaring wrong. The result is an ironical anti-climax of having built a magnificent place in which to say something and then having nothing to say. What shall it profit a church to gain a whole world of Gothic arches and stained glass windows and lose its own voice? We do not believe the day is far distant when many Christian congregations, rather than have the soul crushed out of them by an unbearable weight of "overhead," will walk out into the streets as in older days, where, under the blue sky with no overhead but the face of God Almighty, they will be able to proclaim the unhindered word of God to this generation. Many a congregation would do well to lose a half finished church building by leaving it half-finished if that were necessary to save its own soul. It might lose a First Mortgage but it would find a Second Blessing.

The churches so often lose this Second Blessing because they scatter their efforts in minor conflicts, sometimes judiciously chosen because they are so minor and remote from the main issues of life. They chose their opponents carefully and cautiously. It is possible to make a great bluster and parade of audacity when we are assaulting something that can't hit back, or something which will arouse no one's ire or defense. Mr. E. W. Howe, the Kansas journalist and author, says that he has learned in forty years of newspaper experience that the only safe thing to attack is the man-eating shark! That expresses the platform of some doughty warriors exactly—"Down with the man-eating shark!" They pick out some "safe" demon to attack, from which there can be no "comeback" from the allies of the poor demon because it has no allies.

ONE thing seems sure, we will never recapture for our time the splendor of an apostolic fervor, the buoyant intensity of a fearless faith, the glory of being in an indiscreet and headlong conflict, *until we break the subservience of the church to the State.* We have made it our boast in America that the church has been entirely separated from the State. Often that is an empty boast, for while it is true formally the actual fact is that the State has dominated the church, especially when it needed the church to be its tool to work out the nationalistic purposes of the state. This has meant that the church push aside temporarily the dominance of the ideals of Jesus. There is no question but that in recent years that subservience of the church to the State has increased in America and every successive attempt at the regimentation of the minds of the people of the United States, forcing them to walk in a mental lock-step, tends to increase that subservience.

If the church is to find a rebirth of apostolic vitality it must snap the chains which bind it to the wheels of government—cost what that may. It was a great word which the Dartmouth College seniors put into their report on the curriculum a few years ago. They expressed resentment at the shaping of the curriculum to meet the needs of big business enterprises who required an increasing stream of young men to be fed into their hoppers with certain preparation already made. The Dartmouth seniors said, "The college must not be made the bell hop of business." By the same token, the church must not be made the bell hop either of business or of governments. The church should not hop to bells. The church should ring them.

The sequence of events to which this paper has striven to draw attention has never failed in Christian history. Wherever there has been a struggle against the great exploiting powers of injustice which measure men in terms of profits, which uses them as a means and not as an end, there has always inevitably followed such an enrichment of life and an intense reality of spiritual experience that has not appeared at any other time. The blessing reserved to those who fight the Beast has never been withheld from the fighters. If the church at large today could only believe that, it would throw itself recklessly and with a genuinely careless rapture into the struggle for a Christian social order and a deadly conflict with all that impedes it, no matter how respectable, or how hallowed by tradition. It would soon have such a warmth of fellowship at its hearth that multitudes would be drawn by an irresistible power.

HALFORD E. LUCCOCK.

His Cross

HE burned no fiery cross
To frighten men at night;
He bore His burning pain
In sharpest noonday light;
He wore no hiding mask
Below His crown of thorn;
He healed the flesh of men
Whose flesh by men was torn.

He offered love to all
And took with soul unbowed
Jeering, abuse, and blows,
The spittle of the crowd.
How strange it is that men
Should lift His banner high
When they go out to kill
As He went out to die!

MARGUERITE WILKINSON.

Why Barnum Was Right

GOODWIN B. WATSON

NO one seems to question the fact. A fool a minute seems to be a moderate estimate. The most generous appraisal of mortals seems to be in Lincoln's faint reservation about the possibility of fooling all of the people all of the time. Gullibilities abound. New thought and new moons; gland rejuvenation and gold bricks; preparedness and pyorrhea; fashions, faith-healing and fortune-telling; demons, democracy, and dance-crazes; Coueism, crusades, correspondence courses, color perils, Congress, and college degrees!

What a picture they make! Despite the efforts to teach general science in public schools and the frequent characterization of this age as one of science, advertisements of hair tonics, weight reducers, shaving creams and "Keys to Power," multiply. No cool disillusionment seems to have checked the enthusiasms of standard bearers for spiritism, Wall Street, prohibition, youth movements, communism, Cautious Cal, modern art, radical-baiting, free-love, or the society for the suppression of vice. Though all the major officials of the state were put in jail, there would doubtless remain those in Indiana interested in buying and selling sheets with ten dollar membership fees.

Why? Inquiry often brings some such answer as this. "You musn't dismiss these matters lightly. People aren't all fools. If so many support it, there must be something in it, after all. Where there is so much smoke there must be at least a little fire." In almost these words a distinguished theological professor recently raised a wall of protest to shield his interests from scientific criticism and appraisal. So many people have fallen for it there must be something in it. Reasonable enough, but what? What is that something upon which enterprises rest which have not sufficient intrinsic merit to withstand critical appraisal?

PSYCHOLOGISTS, for all their terror lest the tricky subject of human motives lead them astray from the paths of scientific caution, are accumulating a list of hypotheses about such situations.

First, there is the conformity to social pressures, alias the "Keep in Step" tendency. Upon this theme there is no better dissertation than one made long ago by a psychologist not listed in the academic annals. It is Hans Christian Anderson's tale of the emperor's new suit. The crafty tailor daily built up new rumors of his marvelous creation. Fashion experts feared to admit incompetence. The emperor himself dared not break the bubble of social expectancy. Finally, clad only in figments of the imagination, the emperor paraded forth through the admiring throngs with none save an irreverent small-boy to break the spell. It is conceivable that many a house of cards would tumble today, if the adult guardians around it ever submitted it to the mercies of a good tough small-boy. At any rate, there is sound basis for the belief that most adults will fear to be different. If incompetents be in places high enough, or the drivel be written in books big enough, then people will not dare openly to admit their suspicions that the whole thing is ludicrous. Some people will even be found vigorously applauding suggestions that there is nothing but poppycock in ideas, causes, and ways of life they know from experience to be rewarding, because the de-bunking of those ideals chances to be the fashion of this age.

In much gullible behavior the psychologist sees a second factor which he may be permitted to call the dynamic aspect of habituation, but which may better here be called the "dashboard" tendency. Horses had always kicked up mud against the dashboard. What difference would it make if there were no horse in front of the first automobiles? The dashboard was found there anyhow, just as its counterpart may be found in the trappings of most institutions. Dash boards had always been, therefore they must be. To do things as we have done them in the past is satisfying. To be upset in our routine is annoying. To carry on business with the ethical maxims which worked in 1850 is more comfortable than to revise those maxims to fit the modern industrial situation. To have to build new habits of responding to other persons, to Negroes for example, is painful. For some, there is no more comforting moment than that in which they sing at the customary place, to the customary tune,

> "As it was in the beginning,
> Is now, and ever shall be,
> World, without end, Amen, Amen."

Education is a rewarding hunting-ground for one in search of the shells of something once throbbingly alive. Pupil-years uncounted are wasted upon formal activities sometimes called chemistry or gymnastics, or latin, or manual training, or algebra, or English history. Life has moved on from some of these activities. They remain—just dashboards; but a large public would defend them against all new-fangled notions of letting modern needs set the educational tasks, and

all of life be its background. Sermons and lectures, survivals of the day when printing cost prohibitively, and few could read, can be perpetrated upon intelligent persons today with less ballyhoo than is required to get an audience for a bearded-lady sideshow.

A third tendency underlying the popular appetite for hokum, both creates and propagates it. This may be called a transference of infantile attitudes, but for present purposes will be dubbed the "papa knows best" feeling. "I never think about religious questions," said a well-known advocate of newer methods of education. "I leave that to Bishop Manning. I will believe whatever he says. It is his business to be right." What spiritual descendant of the witch-doctors and medicine men could fail to respond to such touching confidence? Be he ever so ignorant, nothing more would be needed to make him pose as, and be received as, a savant. Hence professors of botany elucidate religion, vice-presidents of advertising corporations dispose of philosophy with brusque gestures, doctors of medicine lay down quaint precepts in ethics, postmasters determine sex mores, while secretaries of state set up standards of economic orthodoxy and freedom from moral turpitude. The burden of blame rests, perhaps, more on those who trust than upon those who respond. The dogmatizer only follows his cue. The outcome is the promulgation of myths and shams as ridiculous as any which amuse the gods.

Another fruitful source for the breeding of humbugs may be sought in the tendency of human beings to compensate, or, in other words, to put balm on their injuries. Around each of the sore spots in the experience of most people, the quacks have gathered with remedies. Do people often become hurt because they are in inferior jobs, are poor public speakers, are capable of only the crudest piano-playing, or are being beaten in the blind struggle with sex? Then depend upon it, quick and easy methods will be advertised, dangling before hungry hearts the satisfactions of dominating positions, effective speeches, surprising musical performances, and successful love. Books on etiquette sell to those whose high school days were marred by a sense of social inadequacy. Directions for developing robust wills attract those who never achieved independence. Beauty clay is sold less to Miss America than to those who have never a chance at that tinsel crown.

SHAMS are not all balm for the injured. Another group of them gratifies a none-too-lovely tendency to get even with life. They may be called subtle revenges upon the successful. Let the Jews come into significant financial control and there will be a ready market among the out-classed Gentiles for anti-Jewish propaganda and societies. Be a conflict, industrial or international, ever so costly to everyone concerned it can win adherents if it seems to offer to underdogs a way of getting even. Sometimes the revenge may be quite unconscious as in some aspects of the feminist movement, or in the Comstockery of one denied life's more luscious pleasures.

Crusades, empty or deadly, may survive because of a sixth factor which might be called by social psychologists a wish for recognition, or here, a "brass buttons" tendency. Offer a man a uniform or a bank account or a name on his office door, and these will slyly remake his whole philosophy of life. Make him president or factotum or Grand Exalted Potentate, and he will turn his back on his family and thieve the time due every other interest which has found a resting place in his soul. Offer him a gold key to hang on his watch-chain, and he will turn his sunlight into mustiness and his nights into hot grey restlessness.

The seventh group of gullibilities is made possible by a tendency to gain distinction through unusual brain-children. Whatever its intellectual defenses may be, it is probable that many a delusion is born and perpetuated because of the satisfaction it brings to those who, without it, would be nonentities. Notice is most likely to come to a novel proposal. Yet the enterprise that is wholly original is apt to be largely wrong. Right or wrong, however, it may fulfill its emotional function for the individual. The idea may be radical or reactionary. Psychologists have found that extreme radicals are much more like extreme reactionaries, emotionally, than they are like the middle groups. Each is in some way trying to live out his life in his espousals, there to put in counter-twists to balance childhood distortions. Frauds arising in response to such needs may have little or no correspondence with reality. They serve other masters. Though I be halt and blind in body and soul, if I can but propound such a notion as, for example, that a deep desire to chew gum (carried on from sucking reflexes) is basic in human nature, furnishing the original dynamic for all such sublimations as speech, song, and osculation,—then I am become somebody. Once the bizarre proposal is launched upon its way, other outcasts hasten to acclaim it. Some perhaps are carried by a crowd before whom they do not wish to appear ignorant, others may feel in the idea some salvaging of established habits of thought, more will be impressed by learned words and professors, still others will need balm for inadequacies, or revenge on conventional parents, while others may find in it a chance to wear the brass buttons. Let it wear deep economic ruts, and build institutional edifices, and its uprooting will be a task for the centuries.

This proposal, or any other, will quickly cover its real supports by rational defenses. The process of rationalization, concocting good reasons for believing

as one wishes to believe, is so familiar as to require little more than mention. The reasons educed may be good or bad, the essential point is that they are irrelevant. What matters is that the enterprise is somebody's brain child. It matters that people look trustingly up to certain influential persons for light. It matters that the idea offers places of prestige, avenges the slights and compensates for inadequacies. If habits are established that can be changed, since they are habits, only with annoyance, then respectable reasons for supporting the enterprise will abound. It may appear that the enterprise helps certain individuals. It may be demonstrated that it is socially desirable, bringing greatest good to the largest number. Perhaps it may be shown to enrich life, to add to its zest, or to lead on to other desirable activities. All well and good. Yet the fact that the real bonds which hold people to it are in one or another of the seven sources of shams may make the enterprise questionable. If it tends to rest upon something other than its rational inherent values, then it strengthens the tendency to work for those substitute satisfactions which are obtainable alike in enterprises wise and foolish. There are those who would recommend a deep and abiding skepticism of any idea or activity which is rooted primarily in the fool-breeding tendencies of man.

Finally, it may be noted that most delusions grow up out of the fears and deprivations of life. They are children of the darkness. If life were really interesting and satisfying, shams might not be needed. Does life grow dull and tedious, a little round of petty satisfactions? "Ho hum, let's have another war!" No idea, so it be novel, is without merit to the utterly bored. No easy gold coaches are without appeal for the factory Cinderella. No badge is unnecessary for the man whom men forget. Dreams of sugar plums and fairy-wands are compelling for those who have never grown up. Multiplication of myths, shams, hokum and all other satisfying unrealities, is symptomatic either of a reality which has not yet been molded to fit the needs of men, or of men not yet matured to face reality. Perhaps both. Yet, after all, aren't the sugar plums fun?

In Defense of Shams and Myths

E. W. HOULDING

ICONOCLASM is an easy diversion, and is today becoming dangerously popular. As long as it is directed toward the past, we have little cause for concern. The course of our lives is not perceptibly altered by learning that it was not William Shakespeare but Francis Bacon,—or was it Roger?—who wrote Shakespeare; or that it was not Christopher Columbus but Salvador Goncalveszarco who discovered the New World, and that when he,—or the other fellow,—got there he found the natives already able to speak Portuguese. The whitewash has been laboriously, or cleverly, removed from all our dead heroes, and the disappointment is scarcely greater than our relief on finding that they "also are men, with natures kindred to our own." Those who still believe in the flatness of the earth, or in spontaneous generation, are so few that one should be doing no great damage in destroying their belief. Even the slogans of ten years ago have long since become so patently camouflage that they are no longer part of our mental defense equipment: they, for us, are now of the dead past, and attacks on them leave us cold. But permit attacks on current myths and shams and we all stand in danger. We cannot but view with alarm the tendency to attack these bulwarks of civilization.

"Abolish all sham" may be permitted as a copybook platitude, but imagine, if you will for a moment, the disaster should some Higher Power suddenly abolish all sham from our midst. We of the white collar jobs would suddenly find ourselves minus our collars. I do not know enough of the history of clothing to say whether or not the necktie would go too,—if it stayed the event would be no less embarassing. Your vest would go; unless it is all wool in the back as well as front,—mine isn't. Except for their fur coats the ladies would suffer less loss than the men, for obvious reasons; but it is no less obvious to most eyes that many would be minus their silk stockings. The history of earthquakes rolled into one would not equal the real estate crash. Banks would be particularly hard hit as their onyx and marble veneers collapsed to nothingness, but unless you live in a log cabin, the chances are your home would suffer too.

And imagine conversation deprived of sham. How many of the little amenities that serve as bumpers and shock absorbers as we jostle along through life would be lost to us! Probably you can recall some time in your life when you either said, or had said to you: "Glad to meet you; please sit down," when the speaker really hardly meant it. Yet on a backward look you can see how that bit of conventional cordiality paved the way for something worth while for both. We need language to conceal our thoughts. The person

who does not adhere to customary conversational shams may be a finer character than the rest of us, but he is as embarrassing as one who would wear clothes only for warmth. The greatest American authority on the Chinese has remarked with some sarcasm that they can furnish a dozen reasons for their conduct in any particular case without giving the right one. Granted that this is true, and that their proficiency in this line exceeds ours: it is convincing evidence that they are more civilized than we. What embarrassment it would cause to others as well as to yourself could you not furnish alibis for some of your conduct? What parent has not had occasion to blush because his offspring was not sufficiently sophisticated to sham when sham was called for by our code?

NOR is it only for society that we need the protecting coloration of shams. We need them for our own inner mental health. Very few, if any, are built strong enough to face the world of factual reality without such defense. If you consciously drank coffee and smoked tobacco because you were a drug addict, the effect would be morally harmful; no, you drink to stimulate your nerves, and smoke to soothe them, as the case may be, and your conscience is unharmed. If you played golf because the doctor told you to, you would lose much of the benefit; but you exercise for sport's sake and so get the best out of it,—though in your heart of hearts you could wish to be a superman and work at your career sixteen hours a day. So we find excuses for what we want to do, and rationalize what we have to do, and keep going. Without the psychological possibility of such defense reactions to cover our conduct from our own eyes, as well as the eyes of others, I fear most of us might not find instinct strong enough to keep us from suicide. Few are intellectually strong enough to work for work's sake.

Marriage is an important sham maintained by Church and State to protect the home, the fundamental unit of society. Countless generations have experimented with unnumbered ways of regulating sex relations, and few would question but what we have the best ideal as yet worked out. But we have to confess that most Americans do not live up to the convention, and we rightly regard the increasing breakdown of marriage as a very dangerous symptom in our social world. *Homo sapiens* (what a sweet sham that name is!) is not instinctively monogamous. But it would be a sad day for society were it to lose the sham,—or social convention, or ideal, if you like,—of monogamous marriage to curb and control human instinct.

But it is particularly in the realm of religion that I wish to defend the value of myth and sham. The K. K. K. need sheets and hoods to conceal its righteous indignation, the many and various fraternal orders need elaborate secrets to cement their fellowship, the military build up a rigamerole of regimentation to maintain nationalism; likewise, religious bodies are dependent on their rites, rituals and forms. The one notable exception is the Friends, or Quakers, and the smallness of their numbers in spite of the reasonableness and quality of their faith, is but proof of the universality of this truth. Twenty-five centuries ago inspired prophets told the world that God cared for none of these things, but desired only that we "do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with God." But whatever the wishes of God in the matter, the needs of men have necessitated these myths and shams to support and carry on organized religious life in their communities.

During the past decade the chief charge against religion has been that it is the opiate of the people. This has been echoed and re-echoed around the world. The charge is not without justification, and I believe rightly so. The successful doctor needs to understand and use the psychological effects of sugar pills, drugs of the proper color, sufficiently bitter potions. Just so the successful minister has to fit in with what his parishoners have learned to expect in garb, language and method. A doctor in the present imperfect state of medical science is at times reduced to the use of opiates as the alternative to doing nothing to relieve suffering. And likewise, in the present state of society, there are times when the best a minister of religion can do in an individual case is to administer an other-worldly hope to the sufferer for whom this world offers little but sorrow. Some years ago in a foreign country it was my duty to turn a Christian schoolgirl over to her grandmother to be sold. More recently my wife and I tried to give a chance in life to another child caught in an unhappy environment. We only succeeded in bringing upon ourselves the criticism of colleagues, the cursing of other religionists and the pain of being greeted on the street as "papa" and "mamma" by a pretty young prostitute. We have faith that some future day true religion will have made impossible such wreck of young lives; but meantime what have we better to offer them personally than the hope of a heaven beyond as an opiate to this present world? I could wish an opiate myself to forget their tears.

MARK TWAIN has told us of how he kept his mule walking up the treadmill of the river boat by hanging a cabbagehead just out of its reach. When he wished to stop, he lowered the cabbage out of sight. When he wished to go ahead, he hoisted it again, and the motive power was turned on. The mule did not get the cabbage, but by indirect methods progress was attained and the mule went somewhere. Is

not this world largely run on just this sort of plan? We are kept moving by ideals which a wise Providence keeps just out of our reach, and somehow progress results. There is no general agreement as to where we are going, not even as to whether we are going up or down stream, but we are obviously on our way. And that in itself is good. We all know James Whitcomb Riley's touching poem. "There Little Girl, Don't Cry." For the child there is held out the hope of schooldays; for the schoolgirl, the life of love ahead; for the broken-hearted woman, heaven. And perhaps, if Riley could come back to us from that which lies beyond the grave, he would add still another hope ahead. Philosophers tell us that it is in the pursuit and not the attainment that happiness lies. But we need a hope ahead to keep us at the pursuit; and more, we need to forget that our hope may be a myth and turn to ashes in our hands. For one who has been disillusioned of some hope, life has little to offer until some new hope is found. One of the chief offices of religion is to hold the best hopes, the highest faith, before our noses. When one cabbagehead,—if I may be permitted to continue the simile,—withers, the leaders of thought must find another.

Take, for instance, in the history of Christianity the doctrine of the imminent, pre-millenial, second coming of Christ. For most who will read this article, this means no more than the reincarnations of Buddha, except for its historic connection with their faith. But in the past, from the apostle Paul down, it has been a most vital and urgent motive to action; and today there are tens of thousands throughout the world of the most unselfish of those who are ministering to the sick and needy in body and soul to whom this "blessed hope" is a prime factor in turning their lives into channels of loving service for humanity. But probably most of us in this generation who are seeking to make this world a better place "tomorrow" find ourselves largely motivated by a faith in the possibilities held out by evolutionary science. And now we are told on good authority that science is a false Messiah! Some of us are already too old to change readily, and will stick to our faith in science, but if this is a will-o-the-wisp, then the crying need of the hour is to give us another light ahead. We must "follow the Gleam," or perish in the swamp of pessimism.

So I plead that current myths and shams be spared at least until we have others, newer, better, and more to the fashion. However shabby our mental clothes may be, you must in common decency provide us with new before asking us to disrobe. Then we will be quite ready to discard our old, or only slip into their familiar comfort within the seclusion of our home. What is needed is salesmanship for the new, not attack on the old.

The Myth of Military Security

EMILY GREENE BALCH

SECURITY may not be the real ground of military preparedness, but it is that chiefly and most commonly put forward.

We are happily past that stage where great States could stand in the light of day as proposing frankly to play the marauders. Even Prussia, as we now know, was not in fact what she was represented by the propaganda of the war—a state armed to subjugate the world. No one advocates preparation for conquest.

Nevertheless a "powerful military establishment" is a handy and tempting instrument for an ambitious statesman. Its menace is heard through the parlor tones of diplomats with a veiled but well understood meaning. It is the sword thrown more or less visibly into the scales of every negotiation. It helps the great Power to get its way, right or wrong.

This motive for armaments is not so much more avowable than that of bare conquest. If we consider it freshly and candidly we see how indecent is a state of things where a Denmark or a Switzerland must expect to come out at the small end of the horn because it is weak in a military sense. The world does seem to be moving out of this stage also and the faster for all that is meant by Geneva and the Hague.

The consequence is that a more presentable reason for seeking military strength must be found and this is camouflaged as needed for self defense. The proper explanation for preparedness is that it is necessary in order that peaceful citizens may be able to sleep o'nights.

One argument against this justification of armaments is that they are not available to those small and weak peoples who are the least secure. To them, and they are the vast majority of the fifty and more "independent" countries of the world, security by means of preparedness is out of the question. It is only possible for those states which are so powerful that gratuitous attack upon them is almost unthinkable.

But laying this argument aside we have a prior question. Security—yes, but security against *what?*

War once begun, a powerful army and navy may doubtless make the chance of victory greater and the chance of defeat less and this is an old consideration which still hypnotizes us. But the truth is that we are in a new situation which is unfortunately not sufficiently realized.

MILITARY security has become a myth because the prime danger is no longer either danger of defeat in war or danger of being bested and browbeaten by the more powerful. The danger is war itself. The modern power to destroy is overwhelming. Defense against it is utterly impossible. The "next war" is likely to be the last war for grisly reasons. We have to fear not losing "the next war" of which people talk so lightly, but of being involved in it.

Modern war is intolerable for victors and vanquished alike, not only because of the suffering and destruction that it entails. It is intolerable on a nobler plane, equally because it means demoralizing, in the most literal sense, men, women, and children by filling them with suspicion and hate which it is a slow, difficult business to work out of the mental system, and which are in themselves fruitful causes of new wars.

We need security not against being beaten in war, but against being drawn into war and from this angle we see how outworn a myth is the belief that preparedness makes for safety.

A big army, as said above, may improve chances of victory once war is begun, but it increases the chances of war. As Senator Hoke Smith said, "Big armaments are only an invitation to war."

Out of his ample experience General Frederick B. Maurice solemnly stated, "I went into the British Army believing that if you want peace you must prepare thoroughly and efficiently for war. I believe now that if you prepare for war you will get war."

In a similar vein Stresemann, at the plenary session of the League of Nations Assembly on September 10th, said that as far as the questions of security and disarmament were concerned he would once more state that each was a condition of the other. It was impossible to prosecute war while continuing to base security on the maintenance of armaments.

But most men do not think so far for we are still curiously childlike in failing to consider the natural consequences of what we do. It is obvious that it makes us stronger to increase our forces, and we stop there, without continuing, "Yes, unless it leads those we fear to increase their forces still more."

If we saw Tommy fitting himself out with a handy big stick and Sammy filling his pockets to bulging with good stones for his sling and each told us that he did it to make sure there would be no fighting—what should we think of these small boys?

We need to appreciate that military preparedness is a language as well as physical fact. One thing that it says is, "I am seriously considering the possibility of going to war. It looks sufficiently probable for me to think it worth while to withdraw from much needed constructive use these millions of money and these hundreds of thousands of men."

Let a country once really undertake to become overwhelmingly strong on land or on sea, at once by a sort of polarization it evokes corresponding efforts on the part of that country or group of countries which it has in mind in so arming and on the part of others too. If it is very powerful it evokes, above all, counter alliances.

More and more clearly the stage is then being set for war. Then evolves the fatal state of mind and state of facts that are characteristic of the race in armaments. The allies egg one another on, involve one another unreasonably and create a fatal division of responsibility. The situation becomes more and more tense and explosive.

Under such circumstances the crack is bound to come and if it comes again it will be the crack of doom.

J. J. Lankes.

Dreaming True

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

"We are the music-makers,
And we are the dreamers of dreams."

TO "follow the gleam," to devote "lives, fortunes, sacred honor" to the service of the ideal, this is the highest duty as it is the noblest privilege of man. But how can we know that the ideal is not a fantasy, the gleam not a will-o'-the-wisp? What is the test of reality in this world where false lights burn on every shore? There is no tragedy more utterly pitiful than that of the man who lays down his all in sacrifice to a delusion. But delusions are not always easy to detect. The best minds may be deceived. How may we guard ourselves from such experience?

An example of what we have in mind is found in the millions of men and women, flourishing in our time as in earlier times, who believe in the second coming of Jesus Christ. Today, exactly as in the first century of the Christian era, there are multitudes who await that fateful moment in the not distant future when the heavens will open, the Son of Man descend out of the clouds, and his judgment-seat be set up on the earth. Then the wicked will be punished and the good rewarded, and the Kingdom of God and His righteousness be established forever.

Very different from these Pre-Millennialites, and yet curiously like them, is another group of people whom we may call the Utopians. From the age of Plato to the present age of H. G. Wells, there have been men who have forecast the coming upon earth of an ideal society. These men have delighted in describing the pattern of this society, and in their descriptions have achieved some of the literary masterpieces of history. Plato's *Republic,* Bacon's *Atlantis,* More's *Utopia,* Howell's *Altruria,* are only a few of the classic writings upon this subject. All present the dream of a new and perfect world. Dirt, disease, poverty, war, injustice, ugliness, death have at last been conquered, and health, beauty, enduring peace established in their stead. This dream has been the glory of many generations. Unnumbered men have cherished it and labored for it, and on high occasion died for it. Is there any page of history quite so splendid as that which tells the tale of man's ceaseless struggle to fulfil the dream of the millennium which a few far-visioned prophets have clearly seen?

There is a curious likeness, as I have said, between these two groups of people. Both reject the present world. Both look forward to the coming of a new and better world. Both are confident that man, now stricken with misery and death, shall some day find happy and abundant life. In the darkness all about them in the present hour, they see upon the far horizon a gleam, for which they leave all and follow. These are striking similarities. Yet, in spite of these similarities, we agree that, in the case of the Pre-Millennialites, the gleam is a phantom light; whereas we say just as unhesitatingly, in the case of the Utopians, that the gleam is a living flame of truth.

Why, on the part of every intelligent person, is there this quick judgment of rejection and acceptance? I discover several answers to this question.

FIRST of all, we see in the vision of the Second Coming the picture of a cataclysm. *Per contra,* in the vision of Utopia we see the picture of an evolving process. In the former expectation, everything is sudden, dramatic, catastrophic; in the latter, everything is gradual, natural, developmental. In the one, we have the note of miracle; in the other, the note of law. Extravagant as are many of the Utopian dreams, there is no one of them that seems unreal. Though improbable, perhaps, they are not impossible. For the society they present is but a farthest fulfilment of the good qualities already implicit in our existing social order, and the human beings in this perfect world are men, even though they are, to quote the Wellsian phrase, "men like gods."

The vision of Christ's Second Coming, however, has no connection with anything that we have seen or can even imagine. It is an invasion breaking suddenly into our world from some far realm we know not of. Experience does not prepare us either to receive or to understand such a spectacle. If it came, we would think, as sensible men, that we were being fooled as at a circus. For phenomena in our day are interpreted in terms of cause and effect. Every event is related as a consequence to what has gone before, and as a prophecy to what is coming after. An ultimate goal of development, no matter how remote or strangely beautiful, still seems to us to be natural. But a swift and dramatic consummation, violating the stern order of our world, seems as unreal as the flood of Noah. It belongs to an age not of science but of superstition.

SECONDLY, and in this same spirit, we see in the Utopian idea, however extravagant its terms, a constructive attempt at a solution of contemporary world problems. The dreamer of the Platonic or

Wellsian type takes society just as it is, in all its manifold perplexities and predicaments, and shows how, by the adoption of certain drastic reforms, by the practise of certain political or economic policies, we can move out of our present distresses and thus ultimately into a happier state of things. The Utopian, no matter how far-flung his vision, works exactly like the architect or engineer who is given the task of rebuilding some old and crumbling edifice. He presents a blue-print, or program, and thus lays out a plan of operations.

But the Second Coming does nothing of this sort. This vast drama of cosmic change is innocent of programs or policies. It solves no problems, save as it deliberately ends the world in which they exist. It wins the game, in other words, not by hard thought and consecrated energy, but by kicking over the chessboard. Such a device is too easy—and too futile as well. Some day that board has got to be picked up again, the pieces placed upon their appointed squares, and the game resumed. On no other terms can man become the master of his destiny.

This brings us to a final, and in many ways fundamental aspect of this antithesis. By nothing else are we so determined to our acceptance of the Utopian as contrasted with the Millennialite view-point, as by our instinctive recognition of the fact that, in the picture of the Second Coming, we see God handing something to man, while in the picture of Plato's Republic, or More's Utopia, or Wells's New Utopia, we see man winning something for himself. The apocalyptic conception is wholly consistent, of course, with older ways of thought. For ages men have looked to God to bring them health, to protect them from death, to lead them out of evil. The cosmic plan has been consistently interpreted in terms of Providence working for man's good fortune if he be obedient and loyal. If there are ills, therefore, to be removed, injustices to be corrected, ideals to be achieved, what more natural than to expect God to do the business, and wait patiently for him to take his own good time! And what more fitting that, when he moved in his great task, it would be to the accompaniment of violent upheavals and to the result of cataclysmic changes!

NOT in these terms, however, do we think today. Divine consummations, like divine interventions, are disappearing from men's minds. Providence, as a kind of Aladdin's lamp set to work by pious rubbings, has become an intellectual anachronism if not a moral myth. Prayer, as a form of magic for inducing God to act in our behalf, is swiftly disappearing before the Emersonian prayer "of the farmer kneeling in his field to weed it—of the rower kneeling with the stroke of his oar." Our philosophies now are humanistic, not theistic. Not all the prayers of all the suffering multitudes of men upon this earth today can move the heavens, we believe, to open suddenly and reveal the Son of Man as a Deliverer come to end and to avenge all woe. No! If man is to save his life, or protect his fortune, or achieve his dreams, it must be by his own hard labor and earnest sacrifice. By himself, and by no other, must this thing be done. God may help, *will* help. He is the Spirit, as Wells so nobly puts it, "who fights with men against the confusion and evil within us and without, and against death in every form." But note that it is *men* who are doing the fighting. This battle is ours. No Second Coming would be respectable even if it appeared. Only a world made ideal by man's own toil can be either believable or worthy. The ancient mind naturally enough saw "the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God." But the modern mind sees such a picture only as a phantasm, a delusion. This modern mind looks forwardly as eagerly as the dreamer of an older day to

". . . the glorious golden city
Pictured by the seers of old."

But today we know that

"We are builders of that city,
All our joys and all our groans
Help to rear its shining ramparts;
All our lives are building stones."

THESE, now, are the tests of reality—the canons of truth—that may enable us to distinguish an ideal from an extravaganza, a star from a will-o'-the-wisp. First, the dream which has caught our vision must bear the lineaments of naturalism and not of supernaturalism; it must fit into a scientific as contrasted with a miraculous concept of cosmic processes. Secondly, this dream must be consistent with constructive programs of reform; it must invite the generative and not the explosive, the evolutionary and not the catastrophic, mode of progress. Lastly, and fundamentally, this dream of better things must present itself not as the gift of God but as the goal of man; it must promise a consummation produced, and not merely received, by human hands. That "golden city," says Felix Adler, in his immortal hymn, we ourselves must build

"Oft with bleeding hands and tears."

Judged by these standards of discrimination, nothing is quite so real in our time as the group ideals so characteristic of modern progressive thought. We are men of many minds these days. The liberal, the radical, the progressive, the Trades Unionist, the Single Taxer, the Socialist, the Communist, the Coöperator, the Anarchist, all quarrel more happily and

successfully with one another than with the common enemy. But underneath their conflicting and apparently chimerical ideals, there is a fundamental spirit of accord. What moves these theorists, if you would call them such, is the dream of brotherhood, the vision of the commonwealth of man. Whatever their clashing doctrines, all trust in greater or less degree in the instinct of fellowship and the method of love. "Forsooth, brethren," are the scriptural words of William Morris, in his *Dream of John Ball,* "fellowship is heaven, and lack of fellowship is hell; fellowship is life, and lack of fellowship is death; and the deeds which ye do upon the earth, it is for fellowship's sake that ye do them. . . . How shall it be, then, when the measure of the time is full, and the Day of the Earth is come? . . . Men shall have the fruits of the earth, and the fruits of their toil thereon. . . . They shall all labor and love, and be happy. . . . And fellowship shall be established in heaven and on the earth. (And) this Fellowship of Men shall endure, however many tribulations it may have to wear through."

This is the vision that leads all hopeful men through the darkness of this present world. It is no fantasy. On the contrary, this vision is sound sociology; it presents a sane program of social change; it awaits the heroic labor of men's hands.

"These things shall be—a loftier race
Than e'er the world hath known shall rise
With flame of freedom in their souls,
And light of knowledge in their eyes."

Lovers of Men

THEY who harness the mad primordial love
That, down the riotous roads their veins are, courses,
Lashed by frenzy more than the frenzy of
Unleashed wild horses;

They who forge into steel their power-lust,
Who hammer to shape immaleable ambition,
Chiseling away its egocentric crust
By hot attrition;

They who temper the scimitar-blade of passion
(Though workmanship be unaware and blind);
They who, out of hunger, sinews fashion
To serve mankind;

They it is who shatter the silences
To music: poets, painters, servants whose labors
Build and beautify being; they it is
Who love their neighbors.

—PHILIP GRAY.

Prayers

PRAYERS are like trees reaching
Toward the higher rain;
Who has seen trees reaching
Toward the sky in vain?

—ARTHUR R. MACDOUGALL, JR.

The Acid Test of Courage

NICODEMUS came in the night, secretly, for he had courage enough to brave the darkness and the wind, but not enough to brave the opinion of men.

—*Henry Barbusse,* in Jesus.

Liberty-Not for Mexicans

THERE can be no security if the Mexican people are left to their own devices. Experience has shown that their devices are not so good.

All of which leads us back to what we have always contended: namely, that the United States should exert some sort of shadowy influence over Mexico.

We should say in effect: "You are our neighbors and you are conducting yourselves like barbarians. You are making your country a charnel-house and a battle-field. We are just going to stop you from doing it. And we can stop you as we did the Apaches."

Give them American sergeants to organize a body of *rurales* and we will have what Diaz had—an efficient military police, capable of keeping the country at peace.

We have never attempted this in present-day Mexico, but it was attempted in what is now California and Utah, and parts of New Mexico, Arizona, and Wyoming. And it succeeded.

Let Mexiço come under our system somewhat as Cuba has come. Some people with small minds will be deeply disturbed by the idea. They will talk of imperialism and the beauties of self-determination. Well, the terrors of imperialism have considerably declined. And Europe has learned that self-determination isn't all it was cracked up to be.

—*Liberty, Nov. 12, 1927.*

Brother John and Brother Aymon

ARE there not always two kinds of Christian people, those who take the social order as it is, hopeless of challenge, and withdraw from her in their souls, and the innovators, who count the world well lost for Christ, yet flee her not, but embrace while they defy?

—*From Brother John—A Tale of the First Franciscans, by Vida D. Scudder.*

Not in the Headlines

AGNES A. SHARP

The Population Question Again

The Canadian and British Governments have agreed to spend £1,000,000 (approximately $4,870,000) jointly over a period of ten years to assist British boys to settle on Canadian farm lands.

A Colony of Japanese

The Japanese have contracted with the state government of Amazonas, Brazil, by which they are granted 1,000,000 hectares (2,470,000 acres), of land and agree to settle 300 Japanese families on it per year. In 50 years 10,000 Japanese families are to be established on the land.

The Bryan Peace Treaties of 1914

President Coolidge announced recently, the appointment of Irvine L. Lenroot, former Senator from Wisconsin, and Oscar W. Underwood, former Senator from Alabama, to be American members, respectively, of the Anglo-American Commission and the Franco-American Commission, set up under the provision of Bryan peace treaties concluded September 15, 1914, by the United States with Great Britain and France. Mr. Lenroot was named to fill the vacancy on the Anglo-American Commission created by the death of George Gray, former Senator from Delaware. Mr. Underwood will fill the place vacated by the death of Richard Olney, of Massachusetts, former Secretary of State, on the Franco-American Commission.

Immigration Restriction Is Not A Dead Issue

A copy of the DRAFT TREATY OF PERMANENT PEACE, prepared by J. T. Shotwell and J. P. Chamberlain (published by *The Inquiry*) was brought back to Japan this summer from the Second Session of the Institute of Pacific Relations, held at Honolulu. The young Japanese delegate, who brought it back with him, used it to test opinion of various internationally-minded leaders in Japan. Some were enthusiastic for the draft as the basis for a treaty of permanent peace between Japan and the United States. The majority, however, expressed emphatically the opinion that, if any proposal for peace came from the United States, it should be, first of all, a proposal to revise the present Immigration Law.

Convention of Teachers in Colored Schools

In Annual Convention in July the National Association of Teachers in Colored Schools voted the adoption of: 1. Minimum standards recognized for teacher training: two years beyond high school for teaching in elementary schools and a college degree, from an accredited college for teaching in high schools; 2. the same standards and proportionate expenditure for white and colored schools; 3. a decent and minimum salary scale for teachers; 4. discrimination in the use of the term "professor" and the curtailment of the granting of honorary degrees; 5. improvement and extension of commercial courses and of skilled trades; 6; recognition of the work done by private and church schools; 7. insistence upon the study of Negro History, and appreciation for the work done by various agencies and foundations promoting Negro education.

Federal Trade Commission Asks for More Powers

The Federal Trade Commission needs more authority to accomplish some of its work of eliminating unfair practices in commerce. With slightly increased powers the Commission could work out many problems with industry in a way that would "insure nation-wide conformity with a high code of business ethics, beneficial to all members of the community."

Greece Negotiating Refund of War Debts

Negotiations looking to an arrangement for refunding the war debt of Greece to the United States are under way between the Under-Secretary of the Treasury and the Greek Minister to the United States. The Greek government, according to Treasury records, owes $15,000,000 in principal and $3,750,000 in interest to November 16, 1926. An original credit of $48,236,000 was established for Greece under the McAdoo administration of the Treasury Department during the World War, but the entire amount was not advanced.

Princeton Students to Tour in Argentina

The beginning of a series of exchanges of students between North and South America is seen in the projected three months study tour of 300 Princeton students in Argentina. It is understood that the way will be paved for a return visit of Argentina students to the United States. Provided students of fairly serious intentions are induced to join pilgrimages of this nature, in the course of a few years a more sympathetic attitude toward the peoples of Latin America and their problems should result.

War Resistance

A. A. Purcell, speaking at the International Trades Union Congress in London last summer said, in part, "A powerful Trade Union International is the only effective instrument against war. Future war promises to be waged, basically—if we cannot prevent it—by scientists, mechanics, munition workers and chemists. It must be the increasing task of our International movement to instill into the minds of all those workers directly engaged in war preparations—the ship and submarine builders, the aeroplane builders, the munition workers, the drug and chemical workers and so on—that upon them the awful responsibility rests, *and to make them enter into a solemn obligation to refuse to work in the event of a declaration of war.*"

Mennonites Moving to Paraguay

Among the industrious and desirable citizens of this country are 175,000 Mennonites. Canada has 25,000 more. These Mennonites are now heading for Paraguay, where they have been promised perpetual freedom from military service, exemption from taking oaths, the privilege of conducting their own churches and schools and in general administering their own affairs. It is expected that more than 100,000 Mennonites will remove to Paraguay.

American Literature Moves On

MARY AUSTIN

IT comes naturally to the reading public to think of literary gains as consisting wholly in new accessions of literary talent. And to conceive of such talent as a sort of divine accident, for which those to whom it happens must not be too much puffed up. The American public in particular is unfurnished in respect to new pieces of literature, with criterions of evaluation of any more relevance to the background from which they spring, than is afforded to pictures and sculpture by the grey walls of the Museum in which they are exhibited. The public enjoys the show; they linger in the cosy corners of authority and the period alcoves provided for them by Mr. H. L. Mencken, Mr. Ellery Sedgwick, and Mr. Thomas B. Wells, savoring their own reactions, and largely unaware of their own part in the production either of what pleases or what offeds.

For this the purveyors, and in some case the makers of literature, are as much to blame as the reading public, involved as they are in the naive assumption that the final test of the relevance of any work of art is the number of people who are similarly affected by it within the concurrent levels of time. And yet, in nearly every case, it is the capacity—or lack of it—for appreciative response on the part of the public which determines the values which shall thus be popularly acclaimed. Great poets, says Walt Whitman, require great audiences; but without an audience of his peers seldom does a writer come to the full measure of achievement. Any gain therefore, of reading receptivity, advances the whole literary level of the time in which it occurs. And such a gain has come upon the reading public in the United States within the past fifteen years as should raise the level of literary output for this and the succeeding generations.

It arose out of the events set in motion in 1914, bound in their natural course to interrupt throughout the world the spiritual poise and the art and culture which are the fruit of a given spiritual outlook. That the consequent rending of the spiritual fabric was less devasting in the United States than elsewhere, especially in the inception of the Great War, only afforded the more room for the ensuing reaction on the reading public, which was, naturally enough, an enlarged and sharply pointed interest in the political and cultural history of our western world.

It is characteristic of great social ground swells such as culminated in the war storm, that they are indicated in advance by alterations in the current forms of art expression. Human society retains much of that capacity of anticipating changes in the spiritual weather, which we note so interestedly in the societies of other animals in respect to alterations of humidity, heat and atmospheric pressure, but with us such fore-feelings are so rationalized in line with contemporaneous thought that their function as social auguries is overlooked.

Thus it was in the United States that the haurispices of social change, the free versifiers, the imagists, vorticists, expressionists, modernists of all degrees, which in the pre-war decade swarmed in all the representative arts, took to themselves the doctrinaire assumptions of all social thinking in those pre-war decades. They *were,* as they loudly declared, *the* revolution. But the times were not deceived. Before the paper and canvas to which they committed their affirmations has taken the tone of time, self-styled revolutionists were swept by the revolution *de facto* into the category of symptoms. The true revolution began with a tremendous back-spin toward the source of opinion, directed by the sharpening perception of the fatality of all opinion whether called radical or no, because of its being, all of it, too shallowly derived to withstand the shock of social cataclysm. Here at home the part that was played in the Great War by political factors of which we had but vaguely heard, the part that was played by science, and by the ignorance of science, all combined to create in the American mind the impression that remedial aid to war and war prevention called, first of all, for knowledge and more knowledge. It called, immediately, for knowledge set in order, decoded, simplified; knowledge in handy packages for individual consumption. All of which has been promptly, and for the most part adequately met by the sudden flood of Outlines and Stories of this and the other department of human learning, avidly absorbed into the general reading receptivity.

FOREMOST then, of recent literary gains in the United States, we must rank the better informed and broadened attitude of the reading public. But even this information, this enlarged vocabulary, this accessibility to larger concepts which has resulted from the new type of popular reading, is the lesser gain when compared to the resulting ease with which our public arrives at a sense of authority in opinion.

Deriving from the earlier democratic assumption that since one man's vote is as good as another's, his

[1] Third in a series of articles on "Recent Gains in American Civilization."
Copyright, 1927, THE WORLD TOMORROW. Reproduction limited to 300 words.

opinion has an equal excuse for being heard, there has been an attitude on the part of the general reader toward the writer speaking with authority which, more or less unconsciously, puts him through all the traditional paces of the office seeker purveying votes. Such a writer must not only please at the outset, assuming all the responsibilities of establishing the necessary rapport. He must compliment all the intellectual prepossessions to which the reader is married, pat all his little prejudices on the head, and otherwise put up a good performance; make, as the earlier republican critics used to say, a "commendable effort," on the success of which his right to speak is judged. One does not go so far as to say that this hundred-year-old handicap of the thoughtful writer is completely done away. But the very sincerity of intention on the part of the general reader, the individual desire to get "the correct dope" on the intellectual situation, has of itself, created natural recognitions of authenticity. These leave the American writer freer than he has ever been before to devote himself to the explication of his subject, with a singleness of purpose indispensable to great writing.

The gain in this direction has been not only to the general writer, purveying ideas, but to the writer presenting the groundwork of attested information upon which new ideas are predicated. The presentation of scholarly ideas in western civilization has always been characterized by traits rather directly related to the priestly origination of learning in the western world. It has been characterized by a hieratic quality, preciosity of terms, ritual of citation, formalities of exegesis, which render it nearly unintelligible to the layman. And in presentation to the masses it has been debased by the popular appetite for a kind of intellectual hokum to which all hieratic groups have more or less succumbed. It is not however, in this case, scholarship which has pulled itself out of the slough. It is but the reader whose demand for the humanization of knowledge has carried us on toward releasing the writer from the lengthening chain of traditional scholarly presentation.

THE movement to free exact thinking from traditionalism in expression, here in the United States, has made visible inroads on a literary form much more in use among English writers of established reputation than among us. I refer to the type of fiction of which Mr. H. G. Wells is the outstanding English example, as Upton Sinclair is in America. This is the treatise-novel, the novel in which characters are created and a story developed—more or less developed, since the inevitable tendency of the treatise-novel is to scamp the story element—for the sole purpose of amplifying the writer's opinions. In the United States the treatise part of such a novel has been more often occupied with moral rather than sociological opinions, without being any the less an anomaly in literary expression. One must distinguish here between the treatise-novel and what is usually referred to as a propagandist novel, of which our own *Uncle Tom's Cabin* is the perpetual high mark.

Any novel is primarily a showing of life as it is being lived. Whatever honest convictions the novelist comes to in the course of his study of life, whether that slavery is equally debasing to slave and owner, that the criminal is more in need of understanding than punishment, or that the Protestant ministry may easily constitute a denial of Protestant Christianity, he is bound to set down, subject only to the limitations of the novel as an art form. This obligation to set down honestly what the lamp of his literary equipment discloses, and the equal obligation to literary form, which is the mode of display, there is no escaping. But when the novel form instead of being entered into is seized upon for the mere conveyance of opinion, opinion about prohibition, about psychoanalysis or endrocrinology, about the current strike or the latest electrical speculation, there ensues a debasement of art form such as characterizes the decay of the culture which produces it. That the novel has here at home escaped the pitfall of the treatise-form, as it has not yet in England, is, I think, largely due to the rise here of a new manner of thoughtful writing. In this new manner, as illustrated in the humanization of science, a medium for the legitimate expression of opinion as it is being shaped from moment to moment, yet never outside the illuminated circle of authentic scholarship, has become so acceptable to our reading public that it is no longer necessary to impress our fiction into the labor of carrying it.

This happy escape of the novel, which for several years past has seemed at the last gasp of profitable use, has not yet resulted in any sharply characterized new variation of fictional type. Nothing at least that can be called distinctively American. It is possible that there will never again be any recognizable national novel-form in English. All the life processes, the world over, such as are legitimately to be displayed in novels, draw too much to a sameness; the approaches, the goals, the tempo of individual crises, are all spaced on rhythms universally rather than nationally determined. It is in the short-story, the story of incident and activity whose wave length is derived from the hour, the background, the individual drive, that local characterization can be traced.

ALONG in the eighteen nineties there developed in the United States a type of story conditioned first of all by the content of the general consciousness of the reading public, and almost equally by the commercial demand of advertisers for the sort of "reading

matter" next to which their advertisements could be placed. At that time pronounced differentiations of local color and social inheritance in a country not yet threaded together by the busy automobile, required of the American reader that he enter with sympathetic imagination into as many fictional milieus as there were regional cultures within these forty-eight States. This was a reach of reading receptivity of which no European public was, or is yet, capable. In England, still provincially put out by demands upon its attention from cultures and backgrounds other than its own, it is still no uncommon thing to hear otherwise intelligent readers say that they like the American magazines for their advertisements, but that they cannot "go" the fiction. That the reading public here at home has managed to compass acceptably backgrounds and social inheritances so widely dissimilar as Eastside New York, Southern Negro, Gopher Prairie and Wooley West, is perhaps one of the most commendatory things that can be said of the American experiment as a whole. But the necessity, on the part of the writer, of so displaying the unfamiliar life-mode as to make it acceptable to the limbered mind of the Europeanly-derived American reader, and at the same time keep the story close to the interest of the sort of people who were expected to read the contiguous advertisements, though so gallantly attempted and so often brilliantly achieved, has had an unfortunate effect upon the short story as a literary medium. It had the effect inevitable whenever an art form is utilized for other than the sincere showing of life, subtly corroded, as a cup meant to hold clear water, by a mordant reagent. The long short story of twenty years ago now seldom attracts the best story talent. Were it not that the web of American life has tautened in the past decade to admit of a type of story which no longer suffers the necessity of being carefully plotted on a culture map of the locality in which the story occurs, we should have to chronicle a loss of story power.

Already there is growing up, along the more sophisticated levels of our common life, a perception of essential social unity against which it is possible for a few writers as far removed in origins as are Zona Gale, Sherwood Anderson and Thomas Beer, to pose their stories as cleanly as the Tuscan painters did their portraits on backgrounds of pure gold. This is a qualitative gain, more significant of the gain in spiritual integration of the American people, than as a prophecy of literary form. This type of epitomized short story in which the sustaining web is not woven by the writer's hand but exists somewhere in the group consciousness, has characterized every age and literary language. That it is with us an emergent type rather than a borrowed form, is suggested by its use by writers of the younger generation whose work is not yet completely stylized.

For the present the menace of premature stylization of literary form has passed us by. In the last century that dreary necessity which dogs the footsteps of the English-speaking, of taking up a moral attitude on every issue of life whether or not it has moral implications, did succeed in stylizing the literary approach by limiting the selection of material properly to be treated in fiction. A reasonable explanation of the way any novel or story which controverts an earlier ideal of how it was hoped or believed life ought to be lived here, should finally be thought of as deserving suppression, would be too involved for this paper. That this conviction enforced upon editors and publishers by the reading public, and by them upon the authors, did for a long time constitute one of the hazards of the literary life, no one attempts to deny. But the immense popular success of those writers today, who, like Theodore Dreiser, H. L. Mencken, and Sinclair Lewis, address themselves deliberately to more or less ribald criticism of American life, points to an enormously increased capacity of the American reading public for taking itself with considerable salt.

This is not to say that these novelists do not run the same danger of corrupting the novel form by using it as the too frequent vessel of acid indignation, as the older writers did by excessive moralization, or as Mr. Wells does today by congealing the content of the cup with cold-storage talk. The point I wish to make is that American novelists, as a whole, keep well up to their obligation, when they charge a novel with opinion about the state of American society, of showing that society functioning, however undesirably. American readers acknowledge the truth of the showing by buying their books by the hundred thousand. Capitalists may sputter at finding themselves bespattered with Oil by Mr. Sinclair. Preachers may grow vociferous against Mr. Lewis, and moralists revolt—being too wearied to do more—after five hundred pages of the tragedies of Mr. Dreiser. But loud over all these comes the cheerful patter of the rubber stamps of librarians checking out the books of these authors to a reading public willing to face the worst about itself even when least flatteringly stated.

If the limits of this article permitted, I should like to explain why, even when admitting its objectionableness, I find the cold lewdness and sputtering vulgarity of novels and plays of the past year or two a considerable advance over the saprophytic impudicity of the Freudian era of American fiction. Lewd and vulgar as even such outstanding writers as Eugene O'Neill and Sinclair Lewis are occasionally, it is still a vulgarity as natural as sweat, and a lewdness as unabashed as the things little boys chalk up on barn doors. It has no kinship with the slinking salacity which, slightly disguised as romantic fiction, shouts to our youth from every newsstand, "Come and Take Me." Incredible

as it seems, it was still possible in the prudish nineties for a man who specialized in sentimentalized lechery to be elected a member of the American Academy, which could scarcely happen in our day. So far as our reputedly "frank" fiction goes, one nail drives out another at last.

OF all the indices of literary increase, the one most neglected by the reading public is poetry, for though the reading public does not wholly neglect the poets it is seldom judicial about them. In this it is probably right so far as poetry is concerned with the literary expression of emotional experience. To the people who find complete and satisfying expression of such emotional experience as they are capable of in the poetry of Eddie Guest, Mr. Guest is a great poet, and Carl Sandburg merely another barbaric yawper like that fellow Whitman. But poetry in any period, besides expressing concurrent emotional experience, is the most sensitive of mediums for recording the curve of deep-seated spiritual perception, determining the things that the poets of the oncoming generation are likely to be emotional about.

As the earliest of literary gifts to develop, more fluent than music and more widely distributed as a gift than painting, poetry outruns intellectual expression; It shifts subtly in advance of every admitted point of view and modulates in every changing spiritual key. Alterations of poetic form are found anticipating periods of social reformation, new rhythms, new inventions in stanzaic form, new theories of poetics, new exegesis of old ones, as anyone who experienced the virulence of poetic revolt just preceding the late war will recall. The great eras of creative adventure, Attic, Italian, Elizabethan, have all been marked by high energization of the poetizing tendency and by the use of poetry for the outstanding types of literary achievement. Likewise periods of low spiritual voltage are chiefly distinguished by the debasement of poetic form to convey moral platitudes, sentimental proverbial philosophy and individual rather than social rancors.

To the average reader, recalling the mortal intensity of free-versifiers, imagists, and other mavericks of the Pierian breed of ten or a dozen years ago, little seems left but the memory of an amazing, often amusing, ephemeral revolt. It is no uncommon thing to hear it remarked that "this free verse craze seems to have died down," and not until he is faced with examples from his own current reading does the commentator reluctantly admit that all that has died is the resistance on the part of the reading public, to variations of established poetic form. Very little that the average reader sees conforms either in sound or rhythmic or stanzaic pattern to the preferred versification of his own undergraduate days. What would astonish him more, is that an undergraduate interest in poetry is no longer merely to be excused on the ground of immaturity of intellect. Not only is an interest in poetry as a current medium of expression now admitted as a subject of academic concern, but courses of study in poetics have become a matter of academic emulation.

We are perhaps too close to the first line of poets who have established their right to vary from the classic models, poets such as Sandburg, "H. D.," Lindsay, Max Bodenheim, and the younger line, among whom James Rorty and Robinson Jeffers prick compellingly upon the attention, to insist that any of these are also poets of the first rank. What we can feel sure of is that, should a great American poet appear, he would find ready to his hand a medium freed from the trammels of classicism, but also freed from the obsessions of the revolt against classic tradition. Nowadays the poet may cut his lines any way that best helps his meaning. He may rhyme or not rhyme, or rhyme in a fashion that knows no law but his own poetic neecessity. He may take his rhythms from any of the current rhythmic sources, his verse may have as many feet as a caterpillar tractor, and it is only in the particular poet, by the eccentricity of dispensing with punctuation or doing violence to syntax, that the reader is unpleasantly reminded that the revolt has taken place.

It is true that all the old, hand polished forms and the time-worn themes of poetry are still current among us; but along the forward edge of poetic enterprise the shift of thematic interest to matters arising naturally but of our common American life, is conspicuous: "Hog Butcher of the World," "The Death of the Hired Man," and the Salvation Army. The working poets as well as the working novelists are equally accommodated with material here at home. Already this native material begins to flow from their hands in suggestions of organic patterning.

Not that the new poetry has merged in verse forms taht have anything remotely resembling the fine, flowerlike fixity of the sonnet, the chant royal or the Elizabethan lyric. Nothing could be so unpromising for the poetry of the future as a too rapid crystallization of the present practice. What does seem to be emerging, however, is a new poetic mode, not shaped by the old processes of assimilating one thing to another either by likenesses or unalikenesses, but by juxtapositions, one thing or one idea so placed against another as to form, as Browning said of the harmonic chord, "not a third sound, but a star." A simpler way of saying it perhaps, is that the ideas in a modern poem tend to arrange themselves primitively, so as to mean something other than any one of them mean by themselves. As if an early American should draw an outline of the human countenance, upon which is superimposed the picture sign for water, and at the back of the human figure two or three others hunting buffalo, and enclose

the lot with a circular line to indicate that what he really meant to say is "My face is wet, remembering other years," the whole to be called the Song of an Old Man. One can often catch poets as far apart as Robert Frost and Carl Sandburg doing just that thing and succeeding at it.

If I have stressed this suggestion of new pattern emergence in American poetry, it is because something of this sort seems to the writer to be more or less, and probably entirely unconsciously, influencing the mode of all our most vital literature. One can not suppose, for instance, that Sherwood Anderson and Theodore Dreiser are occupied with the befogged and stodgy lower levels of American life for the mere pleasure of slogging through with it. Or that Sinclair Lewis is interested in *Arrowsmith* or *Elmer Gantry* for their own sakes; or that Willa Cather has an excessive personal predilection either for Roman Catholic Archbishops or Lost Ladies. Are not all of these attempting so to arrange these simple figures in the hieroglyph of our common life, that they may make to appear, if not Browning's star, at least a key word to the great American puzzle, the riddle of modern life? However often a best seller falls out when any of these authors shakes the dice of literary endeavor, we can not suppose of any of them that producing best sellers is their set purpose. It is at any rate clear that they have left to Mr. Wells and Mr. Bernard Shaw the business of trying to make a particular pattern come forth out of muddled individual living. Which seems to make it all the clearer that what our own novelists really hope is that by the truest possible placing of essential figures in American life, some sort of essential rightness in human relations may yet be made to shine out with more than terrestrial illumination. In which hope it is happily augured that the American reading public is profoundly implicated.

All About Outlawry

OUTLAWRY of War, in essence, is a demand for two things:

1. A change in international law making war illegal and criminal, thereby destroying its institutional and reputable status.

2. An agreement among the nations, *not* that they will submit to decisions *all* disputes, including domestic questions, but that in no event will they resort to force to settle *any* dispute.

How any advocate of peace can fail to give assent to these two demands baffles my peace mentality. The fact that the League does not take the initiative in this direct attack on the war system epitomizes my objections to it.

We have numerous international mechanisms but war impairs their effectiveness and paralyzes their operation. I am for arbitration, but, after almost two hundred years of development, while it undoubtedly does stop *some* wars, it does not stop *war*. Arbitration tries to live in the same house with war, which cannot be done. When Jovian war awakes "the little tin gods" flee. War has now gotten out of control, it mocks and defies all laws, morals, God Himself; and so, like Hercules with the hydra, we must bury it.

The right kind of code, real jurisdiction and power for a World Court, effective use of old and creation of additional mechanisms—they will all come when war goes. The legally entrenched war system does not give peace a chance.

A recent manifesto of English pro-League Liberals declared: "The complete suppression of war as a means of settling disputes between nations should be the dominant policy of every country." This cannot be brought about by the vertigo process of using gigantic force, alias war, to end war. It can only be accomplished by a general treaty or many treaties resulting in a change of international law. Let us take the prop of international law away from war. Law must support the moral side or lose its fibre as law. On this foundation alone can we build the structure of peace.

S. O. LEVINSON,
Chairman, American Committee for the Outlawry of War.

THE FIRST OBJECTIVE

AS regards the book by Dr. Morrison on *The Outlawry of War,* I regard it as a cogent and very able setting forth of the next great step that we must take. For my part I agree with him up to the hilt, that we must mobilize the moral intelligence and evangelize the public opinion of our generation until at last we are able to declare war to be a sin in religion and a crime in the public law of the world. Such a declaration must not be made prematurely and so be of no avail, but it is obviously the first objective we must reach, and I somehow feel that we are not very far from it. To that end all other agencies and instrumentalities may be brought to focus and used. They will be needed, and even after such a declaration is made it will only be a beginning, for we have a long way to go, through a lot of bad weather, before we reach a warless world.

JOSEPH FORT NEWTON.
Memorial Church of St. Paul, Philadelphia.

OUTLAWRY OR BE OUTLAWED

"*THE Outlawry of War,*" by Dr. Morrison, is a great contribution to the problem with which it deals. Morrison makes more clear than has yet been made before, that either we shall outlaw war or war will outlaw us! I believe this interpretation of the thesis that war must be outlawed, represents as much of an advance upon the mind of our day, touching war, as the League of Nations constituted an advance upon the pusillanimous peace societies before 1914.

I would like to see groups of thoughtful men and women throughout the country, in and out of the churches, make the "*Outlawry of War*" a subject of real study. It is not a book to be read; it is a book to be assimilated. The program is clear and the documentation is superb.

STEPHEN S. WISE,
Free Synagogue, New York.

Tiny Cautious Steps

MR. MORRISON deceives himself in two particulars in his interesting study of the Outlawry of War. First, he insists that his plan is "a judicial institution of peace" (pages 41, 63, 113). In fact primarily essential is the legislative institution upon whose functioning depends the life of the Court, the judicial institution (p. 65), for until the international code of law is adopted, "war is not finally outlawed." It is this legislative body which is to codify "the laws of peace" and by "periodic revision" (p. 66) to guarantee that the code will not be "a rigid and unalterable system of law."

The preparing and adoption of such a code will be just the process so scorned by the author, "the taking of many tiny, cautious steps through a long period of time" before the outlawry plan can be substantially realized (p. 73).

The second serious fallacy is that "institutions" have ever been outlawed (p. 98ss.). Piracy was not outlawed, pirates were outlawed internationally and punished by the action of individual governments. The duel was not outlawed, duellists were punished. The slave trade was not outlawed, slave traders were punished by the laws of their own governments, acting each on its own initiative, like the United States or Great Britain, and then in case of some of the nations a limited right of search on the high seas arranged for by treaty.

Mr. Morrison sees this point, and although he trusts in the sanction of public opinion to prevent "this high-handed banditry" (p. 213), suggests that he can imagine "certain effective methods outside the law, by which the family of nations could restrain such a [outlaw] nation from running amuck." It is a fair guess that the first sections of the hoped for Code will be a reenactment of Article 16 of the Covenant of the League of Nations organizing the Economic Sanction.

J. P. Chamberlain,
Columbia Uneversity.

Patience and Impatience

THE Outlawry of War is a great ideal. Dr. Morrison's book on that subject is a notable book. The great virtue is in its patient, brilliant, noble insistence on the tremendous truth that ultimately war will be put out of business only through its specific renunciation by the nations as an instrument of national policy, and through the adequate codification of the international law.

Its great defect is its impatience with all present steps toward that end. So far as the book is constructive and positive, I find myself heartily with it. When it becomes critical and negative, I have to part company with it. Its chief errors seem to be these:

1. It insists that we must have a clear definition of "War," but gives only the vague definition that war is an "Institution." The very question is, What *is* this institution? The book leaves that in an unsatisfactory state, with no clear discrimination as to self-defence, or as to internal wars, rebellions, and the like.

2. It represents (or misrepresents) the League of Nations as a "politico-military alliance," as a continuation of the old European system, and as chiefly concerned with using war to stop war. It makes the astonishing accusation that those who favor the League have had their heads turned by the flattering notion that they are admitted by Europe to the ground floor. It gives scant consideration to the outstanding fact, obvious to anyone who knows, that the League is above all, and is coming to be more and more, a co-operative enterprise, relying immensely more on co-operation and conference and public opinion than on military force.

3. It constantly compares the present Court of International Justice with a court which it calls "real," but which is purely ideal and imaginary. It is easy to see flaws in a going concern, and to leave them out of an imaginary institution.

4. The book thus consistently depreciates the facts and forces now working, slights the momentous fact that almost all the nations are using them, and blandly proposes that America shall summon them to scrap their present ways for untried methods which she prefers.

5. It makes a strangely inaccurate interpretation of American history, in ascribing the peace and stability of our states to their renunciation of the right to fight, and the establishment of our Supreme Court. The plain facts are that at the outset the Court was rather a negligible element, had to make its way slowly for some time, and the decisive element was the establishment of a government; the solution was political first, juridical later.

The present working method of League and Court is far more in line with the actual course of American development than the way of Borah and Morrison would be.

But why choose? Why not both? Why not the fullest co-operation possible, and the most generous, with the "going concerns," coupled with steady and unremitting pressure toward the definite renunciation of war by all the nations, and the substitution of judicial process for it as a means of settlement for international disputes?

William Pierson Merrill,
Chairman World Alliance for Friendship Through the Churches.

Unite

EVERY nation in the world ought to outlaw war. Dr. Morrison's book is a brilliant treatment of the subject. If there could be only one step taken by the peoples of the world, it perhaps should be to outlaw war forever, making it an international crime. There are other steps essential: conciliation, arbitration, international political organization, preventing the causes of war, blocking economic injustice on an international scale. There is no insurmountable reason why the advocates of the League of Nations and of the Outlawry of War should not join hands and urge both. If we divide the forces for peace we aid the militarists. Let champions of peace point the way to peace by a united peace movement.

Jerome Davis, *Yale University.*

Before Outlawry

THREE striking things have been done by Dr. Morrison in his book *The Outlawry of War,* which make it, I think, a notable achievement. He has made penetratingly clear the necessity for a direct frontal attack on war and the futility of such peace proposals as would leave war still in the background, even though hedged about with limitations. His carefully built up demonstration that war is an institution established in the fabric of modern civilized life is a second achievement of real importance for the intelligent discussion of the problem. The third thing is the fact that he has in the book made such a challenge to all those who claim to be concerned for peace that the whole subject is bound to get a good airing. As for outlawry itself, I'm for it; though I do hate to be forced to walk the plank of his logical argument in order to get in the swim. We still need a revaluation of the fundamental principles of human relationships in terms of creative good-will before outlawry can get a sympathetic hearing.

Paul Jones, *Fellowship of Reconciliation.*

Some Coercive Sanction Needed

WHILE I have not read Dr. Morrison's book, I think I am in agreement with what might be called the positive proposals which it sets forth. I think that the formal outlawing of war by the nations is a necessary element in any program of peace and that it would be followed in some degree, at any rate, by all the good effects for which Dr. Morrison hopes. On the other hand, I believe that there should be some coercive sanctions. Possibly these should not go further, at least in the beginning, than an economic boycott carried out by all the other countries against the state which should refuse to submit its differences with another state to arbitration or other peaceful processes. Therefore, I think that aggressive war should be defined and, also, legitimate self-defense. The only workable definition of the former is war made by a state which refuses to submit its case to arbitration; while legitimate self-defense would consequently be defense against an aggressive nation as thus defined. This is in substance the proposal which Pope Benedict XV recommended to the belligerents in his letter of August 1, 1917.

John A. Ryan,
National Catholic Welfare Conference

Naive or Disingenuous

I HAVE read Dr. Morrison's book, *The Outlawry of War,* with attention, admiration, and some amazement. It leaves me finally somewhat depressed. Much of it seems to me to be rather remote from reality. Some of it either naive or disingenuous. Dr. Morrison says of the "Outlawrist" that: "He keeps his goal clearly in view. His goal is peace. He is not a doctrinaire as to the means of attaining it. Whatever means will secure peace, genuine peace he is willing to adopt. He is a thoroughgoing pragmatist." He then proceeds to disclaim both the "methodology" of military compulsion and pacificism, his movement includes "those who are by no means convinced that a nation should not, so long as the war system is with us, be reasonably well prepared to defend itself in war." This does not appear to be radically different from the plan of the Geneva Protocol, which tries to prepare to defend other nations than ones own from war during the interval before universal peace can be secured. I cannot agree that there are no steps to be taken before the goal is reached; and to reach Security by means of Arbitration, and thus to find ourselves able to disarm, seems a logical gradation of the way. I am moved to protest against calling the Permanent Court of International Justice either the League Court or War Court.

Caroline B. La Monte,
Bound Brook, N. J.

The Rock that Will Sink the Ship

I HAVE two disturbing doubts about the outlawry proposal. One of them relates to the effect on the existing League of Nations. Dr. Morrison rightly points out that article Ten of the Covenant requires agreement to go to war in a hypothetical case. If the outlawry proposal were adopted what would happen to the Covenant? Would the Covenant have to be drastically amended to permit members to adhere to the outlawry plan? Apparently that is the case. But if so, I think we will do well not to pin our hopes to a general outlawry scheme. The latter is almost out of the question for the near future.

My second doubt relates to the "self-defense" reservation in the outlawry proposal. Messrs. Levinson, Borah and Morrison concur in reserving the right of a nation to defend itself by arms. Dr. Morrison asserts that outlawry and self-defense have "absolutely no point of contact." He states that while a state might conceivably decline to resist an attack with military weapons, there would be no way to compel it to take that course. "Law cannot 'alienate' or destroy" the right of self defense.

As long as there remains the spectre of war for defense against agression the military profession and professional patriots will continue with us, and our military establishments will not be diminished, for even now they are maintained solely for "defense." And so one of the prime causes of war will continue to wield its influence.

I believe that this reservation cuts the heart out of the outlawry proposal as it now stands. Some way must be found to get around this objection and still retain the splendid contribution contained in the outlawry proposal.

Don Chase,
Youth Section, Fellowship of Reconciliation.

Support Both Movements

I HAVE followed the progress of the movement for the outlawry of war to its systematic literary exposition in the admirable book of Dr. Morrison with great interest. I have also read the searching critique of Dr. Morrison's work by Mr. Page and the cogent answer by Dr. Morrison.

My own approach to the subject of ending the war menace has been more in harmony with Mr. Page's conception of attacking the causes of war than with the outlawry program, but in the last year or so I have been progressively more intrigued by the proposition to outlaw war as a bold stroke, which, if successful, would be a short cut to the goal which all pacifically minded people desire to attain. What I should decry on the part of those who put their faith in reducing the causes of wars is such an attitude of indifference towards outlawry as would lead them to fail to support this striking experiment, while it would be equally deplorable if the exponents of outlawry were to develop so naïve a faith in the unique and complete adequacy of their panacea that they would neglect to cooperate in the world-wide effort to mitigate and eliminate the causes of wars and to create an international organization strong enough to preserve peace. I see no reason why there should be any conflict between the two camps. Their proposals are integral parts of a general program of pacific endeavor. The reduction of the forces making for war would make outlawry that much more likely to succeed, while the outlawry propaganda may be regarded as one of the most promising efforts to diminish the causes of wars. It would seem to me that all thoughtful citizens may without any inconsistency subscribe heartily to the support of both movements.

Harry Elmer Barnes, *Smith College.*

Forbear to Slaughter

I HAVE read carefully (and the result is simple bewilderment) the controversial articles of Mr. Morrison and yourself in the November World Tomorrow.

"Unspeakably discouraging!" from beginning to end.

Why on earth, after reading Morrison's reply to your misunderstanding of his positions, did you not suppress both articles and fill the space with almost anything?

F. W. Leavitt,
Congregational Minister, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Findings

Left Wing Radicalism

In its time the Quaker uprising was regarded as extreme left-wing radicalism, subversive of law and order, threatening the overthrow of government; and it was therefore considered a pious and patriotic duty to suppress it by fair means or foul. . . . Compared with the primitive Quakers, the I. W. W. in the oil fields of Oklahoma lead a sheltered and protected life. Far from being drab, their lives were lurid. They reached out toward danger as plants toward the sun. They trekked the whole wide world, challenging all the autocratic powers and potentates of their times.—*Mary Agnes Best,* Rebel Saints, *pp 4, 5.*

Lynch-Fever as Well

Why should we doubt that human intelligence properly applied may solve lynch-fever as well as yellow-fever and typhoid? It may well be a problem of education; but not of the sort of education now in vogue.—*Edward O. Sisson*—Educating for Freedom, *page 46.*

A Secretary of State Denies

I do not know in the annals of history an instance where a people, with truly democratic institutions, permitted their government to wage a war of aggression, a war of conquest.—*Robert Lansing,* A War of Self-Defense, *1918.*

An Ex-President Denounces

The fact remains that we have with armed force invaded, made war upon, and conquered the two small republics (Haiti and San Domingo), have upset their governments, have denied them the right of self-determination, and have made democracy within their limits not merely unsafe but non-existent.—*Theodore Roosevelt in 1918,* The Great Adventure, *pp. 69, 70.*

Not Sentiment but Discipline

You have yet to learn that love is not sentiment but discipline, and that to achieve fellowship is a difficult task.—*Vida D. Scudder,* Brother John, *p. 72.*

Thirty-five Mechanical Slaves

The total measurable amount of work done in fifteen countries with energy derived from coal, petroleum, and waterfalls is more than five times as much as the work done by the people of the same countries with their hands. The ratio of hand labor to mechanical labor varies from country to country. In the United States, where the ratio is 1 to 35, it is as if each of us had 35 mechanical slaves working for us. It is this use of the energies of nature to multiply the work of men that has permitted the rapid piling up of goods and the rise in the standard of living. . . Two pounds of coal properly utilized will do the work of one man one day and a long ton is equivalent to about 1,100 man-days of work.—*H. Foster Bain,* Ores and Industry in the Far East, *pp. 17, 30.*

Our readers are urged to send in significant "Findings" from which we may make selections for future issues.

If A Man Believe

If a man believes anything up to the point of dying on the cross for it, he will find others to believe it.—*Longinus,* in The Trial of Jesus, *by John Masefield.*

Hell-or Heaven-Bent

The scientist cannot stop. Whether he wants to or not, a force over which he has no control urges him on his road of discovery. If the world misunderstands and misapplies what he has to offer, so much the worse for the world!—*Benjamin Harrow,* The Romance of the Atom, *page 142.*

Advantages of Preparedness

The advantages that flow from preparedness vigorously to prosecute war, and the dangers inherent in lack of preparedness, are well illustrated by the War of 1812 and the Mexican War. In the former, by our inability decisively to defeat our adversary, we lost the chance to add the entire Dominion of Canada to our possessions. Not only that, but we very narrowly escaped the loss of our own province of New England. In the Mexican War, being prepared sufficiently to defeat a feeble adversary, we were rewarded by the gift of the vast and fabulously wealthy empire of the Southwest. Those who enjoy statistics may reckon the profits of preparedness and the costs of neglect of the national defenses.—*Colonel P. S. Bond,* Our Military Policy, p. 30.

Only Furious Speech

Let us remember that only the most terriffic exertions will make any change in human institutions. The men who keep screaming out in alarm lest somebody overturn the present capitalistic or industrial order seem not to know that the order is in possession of about all the defense mechanisms there are. Never since time began have established orders so buttressed themselves as they have done and are doing at the present hour. Only the furious speech of the prophet can start anything at all. Only the proposal radically to tear down and rebuild some social institutions can stir most of us out of our inertness.—*Francis J. McConnell,* Christianity and Social Adventuring, *p. 56.*

God Keep Us From Free Schools

Gov. Berkley, of Virginia, in 1675: "I thank God that we have no free schools nor printing presses, and I hope that we shall not have any for a hundred years; for learning has brought disobedience, and heresey, and sects into the world, and printing has divulged them, and libelled governments. God keep us from both."—*Robert Baird,* The Christian Retrospect and Register—1851.

Hoggys and Doggs

In Henry Brinklow's "Complaynt of Roderick Morse," written about 1542, the monastic author says: "I see also a pytyful abuse for presoners. Oh Lord God, their lodging is too bad for hoggys, and as for their meate, it is evyl inough for doggys, and yet, the Lord knoweth, they have not inough thereof!"—*Hastings,* Dictionary of Religion and Ethics, Vol. 10.

Monuments

HOWARD BECKER

EVERYWHERE, everywhere! The corridor leading to the University auditorium: young chaps, some in academic robes, some in old-fashioned spike helmets. Hundreds. "Dead on the Field of Honor." Pathetic, awkward poses in these already-fading photographs: rigid pride, bashfulness, tense anxiety lest the dangling medal might not show, plain boyish clumsiness. The Post-Office: a great dark-brown tablet; names in curlicued gilt letters—"Our Fallen Comrades." Monuments. She-wolf suckling her young, Siegfried, Gothic warriors. Names, row upon row. Everywhere, everywhere the Shadow!

Uncomfortable recollections of Holbein's *Totentanz;* after awhile, death's-heads seem to grin everywhere. Especially when you look at the shiny granite of the monuments.

II

"NOW I always vote the way I think will do most good. I'm a business man, I am, and my vote always goes where it will hit the Social-Democrats the hardest. They stir up class hatred, you see, and you always have trouble with the damned workers.

"Your Ford, now, he's managed to get along without much labor trouble. We're doing our best to copy him over here, but the Communists, and the Social-Democrats, and even the Center, fight our methods all the time. They say that we make the workers produce more, and then don't give them increased wages. Maybe that's true, but how are you going to accumulate capital if you give it all back to them? They'll only drink more beer, anyway.

"The trade-unions are trying to carry out the Washington agreement—introduce the eight-hour day. The idiots! The condition we're in now, and the amounts we're supposed to pay under the Dawes Plan. They'd better make up their minds to stick to ten or eleven hours.

"But the Dawes burden may be lightened in the future. If we can get on a good basis with France again. This steel treaty between the German magnates and the Comité des Forges, and the potassium fertilizer agreement, and the nitrogen combine, may help to ease off the tension. If the Frenchmen will only use a little common sense! We're sick of war, but we want to live, too.

"Now, as I was saying, *I'm* a business man, and I always vote the way I think will do the most good."

III

"WE'LL never support an imperialist war—certainly not! But I wouldn't mind shooting some of these fat-necked bourgeois myself, if it came to that. They sold the Revolution; Noske was their tool; the murders of Rose Luxemburg and Liebknecht were carried out in the interests of bourgeois 'law and order.'

"It's not that they've got so much money nowadays; it's their feeling that they're so much better than we are. But we were good enough to stop bullets; oh, yes!

"Bourgeois society the world over is so rotten it stinks. I've got no faith in any of these bourgeois governments that belong to the League, and now that Germany has definitely decided in favor of the West and against the Soviets, it's easy to see where things are going.

"But this unemployment just now, and Fordism, and all the rest of it, will help *our* cause along. The first revolution turns out to have been a 1789 affair; when the next one comes, it will be the real thing. Then Red Germany and Red Russia will squeeze out the Poles, and with Red China. . . .

"Pah, these fat-necked swine of bourgeois!"

IV

"YES, during the Kapp Putsch. You can see the bullet-holes on this side of our *Rathaus.* The Kapp forces were in there, and the republicans gradually drove them out. It cost us something to patch

up the stained-glass windows, I can tell you. Oh, there's no more danger of a Putsch, no, no. The government was able to stamp out those two powerful secret drill clubs in Berlin, the *Germania* and the *Olympia;* that shows the backbone of the reaction is broken. Count Westarp talks a lot about the restoration of the Hohenzollerns, but the Nationalist party, which he represents, hasn't as much power as it had two or three years ago. *Then* things were ticklish.

"Of course, there's always the possibility that we might have a monarchy again—I don't like this parliamentary twaddle myself—but we'll never have the Hohenzollerns. At least not William or the Crown Prince.

"Come, I'll show you the city council chamber. Here's where I sit, as Assistant Mayor, and over there, around the horseshoe, sit the party groups, all the way from right to left—National Socialist to Communist.

"That blank wall-space back of the mayor's seat? Oh, that's where our dear William used to bristle. We took him down after he ran away to Holland, the coward."

V

"IT'S fine to have somebody to talk to. Every student I've had in these rooms has been anti-Semitic except you. How do I know? Why, they were members of duelling 'corporations.' That means anti-Semitic, almost always. I don't look like a Jewess; they never found out. But I didn't like to talk to them.

"Just after the war it was terrible. The nationalists said the Jews had made the Revolution, and had stabbed the army in the back. They killed Rathenau because he was a Jew, and who knows how many others!

"But they took my son, my only boy! He was good enough to fight for them, to die for them. I used to lie awake so long, so long. When it was cold, that last winter, when we had no fire, I used to think so much about him, buried out there in that cold, wet clay. But I mustn't talk about it.

"And he was such a good boy. I never had to whip him after he learned to keep his clothes clean. . . . Such a good boy. . . .

"My man died three months after we heard the news. Nothing but that killed him, nothing.

"Then the government betrayed us! Everybody who'd bought war bonds lost nearly everything, and the money we'd saved dwindled away to nothing. Yes, my own people betrayed me too. I sold my house in the suburbs out here to a Jewish *Schieber,* and in a little while the money he gave me for it wouldn't buy a box of matches.

"I come of a very good family, but now I rent rooms. I used to have a servant to help me; now I do all the work myself. But Americans don't think any the less of people who work, do they? So my man used to tell me. He was in the States for a long time, in San Francisco. He used to say, 'California, the most beautiful land in the world.' But I was afraid to cross the water."

VI

SCHOOL is out. Here they come, with their book-satchels on their backs, knapsack fashion. Some a little ragged, some a little pale, all clean and neat. Six-year-olds, eight-year-olds.

Everywhere, everywhere, these little Hansels and Gretels.

Struggle; bitter, grinding struggle. Poverty. Hope for the future.

The good will in man. Is it real? Will it flicker out?

What lies ahead of these children? Of children everywhere?

More of those shiny granite monuments? Everywhere?

The Eagle

WHEN the eagle soars and gyrates
Some say he is surveying
The cliffs for a nest,
Some say he is after cirrus clouds
For the lining of his nest,
Some say the eagle is racing
The sky with the sun.
But they all agree on one thing:
That the eagle sometimes
Has to seek into the marshes.

O Bowery Y, Bowery Y,
Wings are folded down where you are
For wing-energy!

—LEON SRABIAN HERALD

Fog Horns

HEARING the horns of great sea-going ships
Lift their dark music on this harbor-tide,
As, stately through the night, they slowly ride,
Bound west to where the dead horizon dips
Beyond Atlantis and the blank eclipse
Of perished moons that guttered out and died
Before you ever slumbered at my side,
I cannot rest, I cannot sleep. My lips
Are cracked with salt that never knew those seas.
Tomorrow we will shame the sun with laughter;
Upon our mouths we'll catch and hold the breeze
And talk of this and that, perhaps, but after,
When the old sea swings in our heart again,
We'll lift slow eyes and understand our pain.

HERBERT S. GORMAN.

Catholics, Protestants, Mexicans

A Reply to Father John A. Ryan

HUBERT C. HERRING

MEXICO, as a club with which to bedevil Rome, grows wearisome. I am sick of the indiscriminate damning of the Church of Rome in the name of Mexico.

I am not suggesting that Rome requires no damning. Rome is getting plenty of it these days, plenty of it is deserved. In this the Roman resembles some other churches. There are certain family traits which show remarkable atavistic capacity.

I deplore above all the rift in the growing unity between liberals of the Catholic and Protestant groups in the United States. I do not greatly care what the fire-eaters from the Knights of Columbus have to say about Mexico. They quite obviously know nothing about Mexico, or the United States, or much of anything else. They are having a great time of it, holding mass meetings in which they talk about the Bolshevism of Mexico, and the peril to American Institutions. They are acting for all the world like the Imperial Wizard and King Kleagles of the Kluxers. They must be first cousins to these worthies.

But I am frank to confess that when Father John A. Ryan of the National Catholic Welfare Conference suggests that some of us have lost our heads in the fracas, I am inclined to feel around and see whether by any chance he may be right.

There has just come from the press a volume by Dr. Ryan, *Declining Liberty, and other papers*. It is a thoughtful discussion of various topics of social concern, and deserves wide reading. He has one chapter on "American Liberals and Mexican Tyranny." He discusses the Mexican onslaught upon the church. In the course of the discussion he deplores "the explanations and palliations offered by American liberals," and quotes me as declaring the conflict in Mexico is "between a forward-looking nation which is demanding new life and new hope and a Church that has settled down to a barren and dead conservatism which lacks social sympathy." Dr. Ryan comments, "This is a resounding mouthful of language, but in the absence of specific support it means absolutely nothing. Indeed, we may well doubt whether its author had any clear ideas in his mind which would give substance to this verbiage." I wonder.

This much I know. There are tasks ahead of the liberals of the United States, Catholic and Protestant which will never be met if the ranks are split over the question of our attitude towards Mexico.

It happens that the Roman Catholic Church in the United States has produced certain of the most conspicuously clear-headed and steady-eyed prophets of the new order to be found in all America. Dr. John A. Ryan and Dr. John A. Lapp stand at the head of the list. No two men in America better deserve the gratitude and respect of every believer in social justice. There are many Protestants who earnestly desire to stand with such Catholics.

There is nothing edifying in the spectacle of Protestants, as Protestants, sitting in solemn judgment upon the Roman Church. It is neither fair nor sporting. It partakes too much of the nature of a family feud. Protestantism is not equipped for this judicial function. It has not reached that fine flowering of social sensitiveness which warrants the presumption. Nor has Rome the right to judge Protestantism. Judging is precarious business.

There is evident in Protestant circles a quite unholy happiness over the afflictions of Catholicism in Mexico. This happiness, to be sure, is quite diluted, and on the whole is expressed in moderate and delicate tones. It is a sort of denatured Kukluxism, of a chuckling rather than of a venomous strain. It is all beside the point.

If we are to discuss Mexico and the Church, it must be upon the basis of our common concern for fair play and social health, and not because of any desire to even scores with Rome.

BUT what of Mexico, and the Church? There are five things to be said about the Church in Mexico. These serve to block in the background without which there can be no understanding the present attack upon the Church.

First, the Church in Mexico is Spanish in genesis and spirit. This Spanish tradition has been kept alive by the constant recruiting of the ranks of the priesthood, and especially of the ranks of the ruling hierarchy from the seminaries of Spain.

Second, the Church in Mexico is historically allied with the conquerors and exploiters of the country. She has been the chaplain of conquerors.

Third, the church in Mexico has been relatively untouched by the concern for social justice which is so marked a characteristic of the Roman Church in the United States, in England, and in Germany. This is not saying that the priests of Rome have been unmoved by the sufferings of the people. They have been moved. From the time of Father Olmedo to Bishop

Mora y Rio, the leaders of the church have lifted their voices again and again in a plea for a more humane treatment of the peon. It has, however, been a plea for the amelioration of existing evils, rather than the demand for any thoroughgoing attack upon the roots of the evil. They have purveyed anodynes to a sick social system, but have done little to tear out the roots of injustice.

Fourth, the church in Mexico has opposed the movement for public education. There are all sorts of arguments to be brought forward in extenuation.

Fifth, the Roman Church in Mexico has almost always taken a conservative, and usually a reactionary, attitude on social issues. They have sided with Iturbide and Santa Ana and Maxmilian and Diaz and de la Huerta. They have stood against Hidalgo and Morelos and Juarez and Madero and Obregon and Calles.

These five facts furnish background.

The issue between church and state in Mexico is not primarily religious. The leaders of Mexico are not warring upon religious ideas. They are not storming the historic positions of the Church. They have no quarrel with her great theses. Mexico wars upon a set of ideas which, in the case of Mexico, has found refuge beneath the aegis of the Cross.

The struggle may be resolved into terms of a life and death encounter between two opposing social philosophies. On the one side, the government of Mexico, mildly socialistic in its general viewpoint, dominated by practical radicals. On the other, the aristocracy, the old land holders, the people in whom the Spanish strain is predominant. Allied with them are the clericals, the bourgeoisie, the sons of the rulers of yesterday. The first group is radical in its social philosophy. It is controlled by the intelligent leaders of the labor movement, of the movement for agrarian reform, of the movement for political enfranchisement. The church takes her stand on the side of the conservatives.

It is no new stand which the church assumes. For four hundred years the church in Mexico has been the private chaplain of the powerful. Father Olmedo marched by the side of Cortez. Cortez conquered, and Olmedo blessed the conquest. Olmedo mitigated the severity of the conquest, and lightened the burden of the conquered, but he blessed the arms of the conquistadores when they went into battle.

The Roman Church is under fire in Mexico because of the company she keeps. From the standpoint of the men who are leading the present movement for the national integrity, economic liberation and racial dignity of Mexico, the Roman Church seems the house of refuge to which every enemy flees. The leaders of the government of Mexico can not be altogether fair. If unfair, the explanation need not be sought far afield. They have learned intolerance in a bitter school, they have learned their lesson well.

They feel that the leaders of the Church are almost to a man resisting the imperious needs of the Mexican people. Their indictment may be listed under four heads.

First: Mexico, they say, needs popular education. There is a passionate faith in the effectiveness of secularized, democratic education. There may be some who will smile at the naivete of their faith in education to cure the nation's ills, but faith is there. The Church, the government argues and the Church admits, does not believe in secular education. The Church contends that its system of parochial schools is better qualified to serve the needs of Mexico.

Here Church and state meet and grapple. Here again it is two rival schools of social philosophy in contest. The state insists upon the public school system as an agency for propagating a radical democratic faith. The Church demands the church school as an agency for holding the people to her ideals: ideals which, so the state contends, are redolent of an aristocratic and feudal age.

I have evidence from the lips of leaders both of Church and state to prove abundantly the opposition of the Church to secular education. It is a conscientious and honest opposition, and any who attack it as dishonest, greatly err.

The church does not oppose education. She is against the particular theory of education which controls the leaders of the present government of Mexico.

Second: Mexico needs economic liberation. This economic liberation means the restoration of the land to the Indian, and the banishing of the nightmare of peonage. The church has stood with the landholders for four hundred years. Its priests upon the great *haciendas* became little more than private chaplains to the *haciendados*. They served the peon, but always as the paid servants of the man who possessed the land. Their position was closely analagous to that of the protestant ministers in the feudal mill villages of our own South, whose salaries come from the mill owners, and whose mouths are closed against injudicious utterance. The alliance has gone further. Until 1857, the Church possessed a tremendous stake in maintaining the status quo. By inheritance and by purchase, the Church had come into possession of immense areas. Enthusiastic anti-clericals tell us that the church owned two-thirds of the wealth of Mexico. I doubt whether anyone knows. But that the church owned a great share of the wealth of Mexico cannot be debated. It made the Church cautious, wealth always makes the church cautious, it matters not whether headquarters be in Rome or on lower Fifth Avenue.

The confiscation of church property in 1857 did not

alter the conservative mood of its leaders. If anything, it made them more dependent upon the favor of those who had wealth. The effect upon the *hacienda* priest and the city hierarchy was identical. The village priest looked to the *haciendado;* the bishops and archbishops looked to the financial lords of the nation. There is no record that the church hierarchy raised any sustained protest against the criminal policy of Porfirio Diaz. Their silence was rewarded with the practical nullification of many of the ecclesiastical provisions of the constitution of 1857. Here again it is only fair to recognize the analogy with the Protestant situation in the United States. We too have village ministers whose entire support comes from the ruling power of the community, and whose economic and political views are curiously shaped by the alliance. We too, have boards of missions whose policies are unconsciously, but none the less, definitely shaped by a regard to what this man and that man will think.

The attitude of the Mexican Church is not to be reduced to a formula, and any generalization is unfair. This I have found, that wherever you talk with a leader of the Catholic church, clergyman or layman, you have a man who stoutly declares the land laws of Mexico bolshevistic, confiscatory, and insane.

Taking it by and large, I venture the truth of the assertion, that the leaders of the Church are against the program of economic liberation in Mexico. I do not charge them with any dishonesty in their opposition. They are as honest as was Henry Cabot Lodge in opposing Robert M. LaFollette. It is simply the clash between rival social philosophies.

Third: Mexico needs political emancipation. Critics are inclined to scoff at the statement that Mexico shows any zeal for democratic institutions. They argue the haphazard quality of Mexican elections, and the infrequency with which the party in power loses at the polls. There is something in the argument. Nevertheless, the present government of Mexico more nearly represents the will and interest of the great rank and file of the Mexican people than any government in its history. It might be more accurate to say that this government represents the thinking and articulate rank and file. It represents the brains of the labor movement, and the labor movement of Mexico is quite largely representative of the workers of the nation, both rural and urban. Furthermore, the present leaders of Mexico are making a genuine effort to educate the people for an intelligent use of democratic control.

The Church, the leaders of Mexico affirm, holds an aristocratic conception of government. They quote history to prove the point. They recite the historic alliance between the Church and the Spaniard, the Church's opposition to the revolution of Hidalgo and Moreles, her backing of the counter-revolutionist Iturbide, her opposition to Juarez, her betrayal of Mexico to Maxmilian, her acquiescence to the tyrannies of Diaz, her steady opposition to the leaders of the revolution during the past seventeen years.

I have found no evidence in Mexico to persuade me that the leaders of the church have any faith in the triumph of democratic institutions. Historically and temperamentally, the Roman Church in Mexico is wedded to an aristocratic conception of government. Her opposition to the present regime is entirely honest and altogether consistent. Her distaste for Mr. Calles and all his works is part and parcel of a social attitude acquired through long association with the exponents of a widely divergent social philosophy.

Fourth: Mexico seeks a national integrity unhampered by foreign interference. Its leaders see in the church a force which is willing to subordinate national dignity to ecclesiastical prestige. They cite the clerical conspiracy which brought Maxmilian to power as revealing the unpatriotic character of the Church. They argue that the present appeal to the sentiment of the United States is but part and parcel of the attitude which has always dominated the Church in its relations to the state.

This then is the burden of the indictment which the government of Mexico brings against the Church. The Church is the instrument of an aristocratic ideal. She is the chaplain of reaction. She is the foe of popular education. She is the enemy of national integrity. Hence the restrictions which are imposed upon her.

The scope of the religious restrictions in Mexico is wide. Education is secularized. The property of the church is vested in the state, and the Church is allowed the use of her buildings simply as tenants of the state. The ministers of the Church are deprived of the right of citizenship and of holding property and of expressing themselves upon political issues. Religious orders are abolished, their property confiscated.

These are harsh measures. They make demands of the Church which would be resented by any church in the United States. No church would supinely submit to the confiscation of its property. No ministry would yield its rights to citizenship. No preacher with any prophetic zeal would relinquish the right to lift up his voice on issues of national importance.

FATHER RYAN has the right to ask, Why do not the Protestants of the United States make common cause with the Catholics in protesting against the infringement of the rights of the Church in Mexico?

I can only answer for myself.

I believe that Mexico makes a mistake in going so far as she does in limiting the freedom of the Church. I believe that it is bad tactics, if nothing else. Never-

theless I shall join in no protests. I have three reasons.

First, any protest from the United States directed at the Mexican government in its handling of the church situation would be interpreted as more American officiousness. The United States has forfeited the right to make suggestions. Our Department of State has brought us into merited disrepute.

Second, any protest from the United States will inevitably disregard elements which are very real in the Mexican situation. If Mexico goes too far in silencing the Church, it is because the Church for four hundred years has gone too far in silencing the just demands of the enslaved millions. The Mexican policy can only be judged against that background.

Third, any protest from the United States against the Mexican handling of the Church would simply be interpreted as one more attempt to bring about intervention on behalf of our investors.

I therefore will not join in any protest against the Mexican way of handling her affairs. It is not our business. Mexico must settle her own business in her own way, and that means oil and land and religion and education. Mexico will make mistakes, but that is the privilege of a sovereign nation. It is a privilege which we sometimes exercise.

No general indictment is in order, not of the Church in Mexico, nor the government. So far as the churches of America are concerned let it be rather a general confession.

If the things which I have said be true of the Roman Church in Mexico, they are also true in greater or less degree of all churches everywhere. For why is the church in Mexico under indictment? Because growing mighty, she has failed to remain sensitive to the demands and desires of the poorest and the lowest: because in growing rich, she has become more and more aligned with the powerful and the wealthy: because in developing institutional strength and discipline, she has not developed elasticity and responsiveness to the growing democracy of the people.

But this is not the indictment of the Mexican church. This is the indictment against all churches. It is the indictment of bureauocracy, of institutionalism.

Not a protest, but a confession, a confession in which Congregationalists and Methodists and Episcopalians and Catholics might unite: We have sinned the sin of greatness. We have exalted bulk. We have grown rich, and we have not been humble.

But what of Mexico? There is only one answer of which I know. Let us take our hands off, and keep them off. Let them work out their own salvation, for no other kind will bring either security or peace. They will make mistakes. They will work injustices. They will commit grievous blunders, even as we. It is the price which must be paid for democracy.

Pacific Sunset

THE sun is a blow-torch
In sure hands,
That softens the bronze west.

Bronze,
Flow to the hot weld
Of night with day.

Stars spark at the joint
In blinding twilight.

Earth,
Shield your eyes
If you would see the dawn.

Once the Moon looked too long
And now is blind.

Hissing,
The metal cools in the sea. . . . .

Waves,
Test the weld;
It will hold against you.

This workman is no apprentice,—
His tools are equal to the task.

H. THOMPSON RICH.

Shadow of Earth

THERE is immortal day:
What we call night
Is not the fault of light—
Earth gets in its own way.

Night is mere shadow of earth.
We should not blame the sun
If Shanghai shades Verdun:
No, blame the world's own girth!

For now America . . .
Now Asia . . . reaches up,
A child for a gold cup—
Both greedy for one star.

Each tramples down the other
And snatches at the sun
In turn: night for each one
Is shadow of his brother.

And, shadowed, each forgets—
Beyond the obtuse clay—
Haloed with deathless day,
The sun that never sets!

E. MERRILL ROOT.

Two Men With Good Cases

DOUGLAS HASKELL

PATRICK HENRY, darling orator of the plain people of Virginia, was looking "beyond that horizon which binds human eyes" for aid against the proposed Constitution of the United States, in an invocation, says his biographer with, that "made every nerve shudder with supernatural horror"—when "lo! a storm at that instant arose, which shook the whole building." A true prophet, the orator directed his lent thunder against the heads of his enemies until, according to the same reporter, "the scene became insupportable; and the house rose without the formality of adjournment, the members rushing from their seats with precipitation and confusion." Yet more likely Patrick Henry's effectiveness against the Constitution in the Virginia ratifying convention was based on the inherent strength of his case.

Only recent historians have admitted how strong this total case really was. As a Virginia patriot, to begin with, it is very clear that the champion was fighting for the precious jewel of sovereignty against the perils of a super-state. The Virginian's was the pride of a citizen of the most powerful commonwealth on the new continent. Only grudgingly and with reservations had Virginia recently been jockeyed by the smaller states into surrendering land claims covering Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee; extending, in fact, deep into Illinois. In 1788 she was still stronger than New York or Pennsylvania or Massachusetts. Let no one think she considered herself simply as one of England's recent colonies. Here was a new nation: of the same language, to be sure, as her neighbors, and bound by the exigencies of a common debt into a close confederation with her recent allies; but nevertheless with liberal institutions of her own, indigenous customs and expectations of a most prosperous future. In Patrick Henry's language it is too clear for conscious statement that the "liberty" of being a Virginian was comparable, in its possessor's mind, to the liberty an American today feels he owns over and above, say, a Turk.

This, then, is Patrick Henry's horror: "this government of the new constitution is not a Virginian, but an American government!" It is not a confederated form but a "consolidated" one! Under the old confederation Virginia has been a sovereign among sovereigns, only a little more so because of her power and size. She is proud of having complied rather well with Congressional *requests* for men and money. But this "national," this "American," this "consolidated" government, no longer asking favors of the commonwealth but commanding services and taxes of its states—this means the end of "the poor Commonwealth of Virginia," means surrender of sovereignty, or, as Patrick Henry calls it, the precious jewel of liberty!

WE sketch but a rapid summary of his horrors. Under this national government, a mere tenth of the population, he argues, will be able to defeat Virginian amendments; it is plain he is thinking of such remote and contemptible commonwealths as little Rhode Island. This far-away central government, so largely in the hands of foreigners, will have extensive powers,—worst of all, that of directly taxing the people of Virginia: and it is dead-certain the federal tax-collecting sheriffs, these "harpies" from abroad, will pluck their Virginian victims. In Patrick Henry's mind the Virginian representatives themselves, so far from home, will be as little in hand as if they had crossed the ocean on foreign policy; while the mischief collectively to be perpetrated by them and the other members of the consolidated government will not be punishable, for poor Virginia loses to these rascals themselves control over army and navy. It is even gravely to be feared that the powerful president will use his personal address with the army to create a despotism, while it is certain that the new courts, taking ultimate jurisdiction out of the hands of local judges, will destroy the typical Virginian liberties of trial by jury and free speech and worship.

Now this consolidation was, so to speak, not to be a league of peoples but a league of governors most conspicuously resembling their British brethren. The same objection held as is often raised against the modern League of Nations that it represented not peoples but interests. Patrick Henry was not clear on this, commanding no economics; but he knew his contemporaries and so his "suspicions" were correct. For Hamilton definitely served the rich and well-born, and Madison in the tenth Federalist defended the new tool as one to keep majorities, "factions" he called them, from infringing on the property rights of minorities. By minority rule, of course. The complex government would everywhere set the majorities at confusion. Those were the checks and balances. Checks on the people and balances for merchants, capitalists, manufacturers and speculators who made the Constitution. From the day Patrick Henry lost his good case till this, the United States have lain under the most conservative of governmental forms, generally under the

control of large creditors and monopolists: even the three loyal sons, Jefferson, Jackson and Wilson, were never able to bend it effectively into the service of the agrarians, the working men, the masses. That fine hope of the confederation was gone.

IS it wrong, then, for us to accuse Patrick Henry—we with our hindsight—of a mind that constituted an obstacle to understanding? I believe not; rather, the more one studies his case, the greater the temptation to a certain irritation with him. His failure is such a preoccupation with his excellent case against the new thing as to blind his imagination to the effects of the *most* important forces of his time. In a word, these forces were those of interdependence. There simply had to be a strong central government to prevent total internal economic unbalance and external insecurity. Farming was prosperous but commerce and industry could not stand the tariff wars between states, the almost war-like conflicts among them over inflated currency, the boundary disputes, the callousness to legal claims of "foreigners." "Are those who have debts due them," asked Edmund Randolph of Henry, "satisfied with your government? . . Justice, in many instances, is so unattainable that commerce may in fact be said to be stopped entirely." Meanwhile above all the States hung the threats of creditor nations concerning their common foreign debt.

So while Henry was concerned about Virginia's sovereignty, the real question was about her future existence and self-preservation.

Our latter-day censure can with fairness go still further. Henry had been elected to represent Virginia in the Constitutional Convention, but had refused to attend, saying he "smelt a rat." So his own agrarian interests remained unrepresented there; and after the rest had compromised among each other and done the best they could and taken the best they could get—knowing all the time the supreme necessity of a close union—Henry's poor farmers were obliged in the end to take a Constitution they had not helped at all to make and by which they really were stung. So Patrick Henry's flashes of true lightning got lost in the clouds, while the prize went to men who, whatever their self-interest, nevertheless possessed infinite patience and a capacity for conference with their neighbors with an eye on the one supreme truth of the time: interdependence.

AS one re-reads the story of the Virginia commoner's pathetic failure, one can't help being reminded of Senator Henry Cabot Lodge. Outwardly the two men were about as much alike as President Lowell of Harvard and the Bryan of Dayton. There may be little correspondence, too, between the situations the two men found themselves in, but the repetition of slogans and attitudes is amusing.

The League of Nations, after another "war for democracy," is before the United States Senate, and the scholar of the Senate—how superior to the uncouth old-time orator—wants to draw its teeth. This is a super-state that will rob the United States of the fair jewel of her sovereignty. In this consolidation a mere fraction of the world's people in remote and backward States will be able to defeat American foreign policies. This far-away League, so heavily controlled by foreigners, will have extensive powers, going over the head of Congress to command Americans to fight in distant quarrels! Quite clearly these foreign debtors are entangling harpies who, if American statesmen enter regular conferences with them, will pluck both feathers and claws. Most especially with the Americans far from home, in the suave and illusive foreign atmosphere. And it is gravely to be feared that the powerful League Council will destroy typical American liberties such as our power to keep unwanted strangers off these shores and to superintend the affairs of neighboring Latin states.

To be sure there is no parallel between Patrick Henry's concern for the common man and the views of the senatorial author of a Hamilton biography. But that parallel is supplied by the late Senator's radical allies, who thunder against robbery of the peoples by an association of diplomats and profiteers.

HOW just as a reading of Patrick Henry's speech gives you no intimation of the new economic forces driving toward interdependence, so in all the cogency and perseverance of the Senator's arguments there is no hint of a vast and overpowering change in American interests from an independent national to an interdependent international scope.

Meanwhile necessarily American bankers have participated in international conferences leading to such results as the Dawes plan, completely conditioning the internal affairs of a large foreign state, and have sold the bonds for the resultant loan at a good profit; American manufacturers protest against foreign tariff barriers; American oil interests penetrate a Russia officially and governmentally taboo.

Without going into any side of the new interdependence other than the economic, it is an interesting question to ask how long the complex arrangements can be sustained effectively while the government, protecting its sovereignty, maintains an attitude of anarchistic aloofness. The enormous fact now, as at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, is interdependence. Now the "fathers," hardly any of them were very well satisfied with their Constitution. But most of them, excepting such as Patrick Henry, kept their eyes glued to the main fact, and so in the matter of keeping peace and making for understanding over a wide area, they were in no small measure successful.

Clippings

From the American Legion Monthly

The best way to make this country Bolshevik is to turn local units of national patriotic organizations into police stations from which czaristic policemen will sally forth to beat up people who are trying to express their honest opinions. . . If I admit that my opponents have such convincing arguments that I will neither listen to them nor permit anybody else to listen to them, that is to admit that my own arguments are worthlesss—*Rupert Hughes,* American Legion Monthly, *July, 1927.*

Stampeded and Run Amok

It is an evil thing to be always afraid. I confess that I do not like cowards; perhaps that is why 100 per cent Americanism lies outside my reach. I observed the American people in 1917 and 1918 reduced to a frenzy of fear by a public enemy three thousand miles away, and obviously quite unable to deal them a blow. I have watched whole sections of them trembling at thought of the Pope. . . Today I see the men of money among them, entrenched and buttressed as no men of money ever were in this world, stampeded and run amok by the mouthings of half-witted soap-boxers.—*H. L. Mencken,* Review of Reviews, *October, 1927, p. 416.*

A Millionaire on Genius

With rare exceptions the man who accumulates great wealth displays no more genius than did the capital prize winner in the Louisiana lottery.—*Julius Rosenwald,* Review of Reviews, *October, 1927, p. 447.*

Benevolent Feudalism

Purely economic considerations foreshadow a long continued growth of the strong at the expense of the weak. The new line-up of business will be accomplished through further mergers and consolidations, accompanied by heavy mortalities of weaker units which are left on the outside. . . . . It is human to become intoxicated with power, and a few of the reflective Wall Street folk sense the dangerous temptation which may confront big business to overplay its hand. An officer of one of the great money reservoirs in the financial district, in discussing this subject, said: "The great need is for big business to temper efficiency with mercy."—*Merryle Stanley Rukeyser,* Nation's Business, *October, 1927.*

The White Man's Burden

Trade in the Far East has been rapidly increasing and the United States has been able to utilize her Philippine base as an aid to securing her share of this commerce. Contemplated large-scale production of rubber in the Philippines would free us from the British monopoly in this important raw material. . . Our Philippine position may be likened to that of a guardian over an ambitious and obstreperous minor who has been spoiled by too much kindness. The youngster requires firm corrective handling, both for his own good and for the good of those who come in contact with him.—*Norbert Lyons,* North American Review, *October, 1927, pp. 365, 373.*

Our readers are urged to send in significant "Clippings" from which we may make selections for future issues.

Mujiks versus Babbits

In Russia nearly 5 times as many books are sold each year as in the United States. The figures are 240,000,000 to 50,000,000. —*Advertisement of The Literary Guild in* Harpers Magazine.

Beyond the State

It is the Face of Christ that modern nations have forgotten; it is the dream of the Kingdom of Souls they have wished to tear from their hearts. Hence, our nationalisms are exclusive; our patriotism is tainted with egotism; cities have become centers of confusion; hence the orgy of industrialism and the Chaos of Kultur which cannot see the Kingdom of Heaven beyond the State nor the brotherhood of man beyond the nation.—*T. L. Vashwami quoted in* The Catholic World, *v. 122, p. 225.*

Unfit for Swine and Dogs

They worked us eighteen hours in their slimy burrows. They killed us by the thousands beneath their rotten tops. They blew us skyward from the muzzles of their grassy shafts. They paid for sweat and blood and broken bones with wormy beans and rancid fat. They made us live in shacks unfit for swine and dogs. They forced us to go begging crusts of bread from brothers poor as we, displaying stumps and blinded eyes as our right to beg. They kept us in their stinking camps behind barbed wire and stockades like prisoners of war—like convicts doing time. And scarcely had the last clod hit our coffins when they drove our loved ones from their company shacks—to scrub and wash, to beg or steal, or starve or rot. And then we met in the dark of night, in culverts, caves, and deserted shafts, to find a way from woe and want, from slavery and misery. Thus the union was born. How we struggled, how we fought and bled for that puny union babe! Oh the tears we wept and the blood we spilled and the lives we paid to raise that precious child! At Braidwood, Ludlow, and Panther Creek; at Mingo, Latimer, and Virden mute tombs still speak of the price we paid for our union. We, too, had our Valley Forge, where we slept on frozen ground, with shivering limbs and empty guts. We, too, left the tracks of bleeding feet in the snow of many a camp. . . . . Now you ask us to desert our union—the union that made us free. You ask—and the hell we will—*From* The Illinois Miner, *as reprinted in the* New York Telegram, *October 5, 1927.*

A Perilous Course

From whatever angle it may be regarded, intervention is a perilous course. The internal quarrels which it settles rarely remain settled for long, the very presence of foreign troops is an incitement to revolt, and the spectre of occupation haunts the trail of the armed peace-maker, however high his motives. Whether it be the League of Nations intervening in the affairs of the small States of Eastern Europe, or Italy or France intervening in Albania or Syria, or the United States intervening in Central or South America, the story is the same; intervention breeds intervention, and what is begun has to be continued.—*Editorial,* Financial Chronicle, *July 23, 1927.*

The Book End

The World Tomorrow reviews only books which it believes to be helpful and interesting. On rare occasions it includes unfavorable comment on a popular volume which seems sufficiently misleading to render adverse criticism imperative.

Disillusionment Without Cynicism

LEON WHIPPLE is rather hard hearted in his history and analysis of religious liberty, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press in *Our Ancient Liberties*.[1] But the honest critic of history is necessarily hard hearted, and it is a relief to read criticism which tears down some traditional conceit without resorting to cynical satire. Moreover, it is quite apparent that Mr. Whipple did not enter his researches for the purpose of proving the validity of a partisan argument on either the justice or the injustice of limiting civil liberty by the exercise of police power. The book will therefore not win many recruits for a fight to preserve civil liberty. Its treatment of the subject is too objective and scholarly. It has, however, much value as an estimate of the difficulties in the way of winning and maintaining liberty for minorities in America, and as a handbook, succinct and reliable, to explain to the average citizen what his liberties are and where they come from.

America has not been consistently jealous of the liberties of the individual, at least in practice. In the Revolution the people won freedom from foreign domination; but "freedom and love of liberty are not necessarily one." The early American fathers were very eager to escape oppression at the hands of royal agents; they gave up much to gain freedom, but freedom for their own dissent only. They were intolerant toward other dissents. For example, they convicted the Reverend Henry Dunster, first president of Harvard College, of breaking the peace, and they sentenced him to receive public admonition, all for inorthodoxy in his teachings on infant baptism.

We need also to be reminded that democracy is not inherently libertarian. In the experience of America, "at the beginning the success of the democracy concealed some of its short-comings, and since then the enduring material welfare of the country has fostered the faith that there is some secret spring of liberty, potent and everlasting, in our hearts." Popular theories about the passionate love of liberty which we attribute to those who drew up the constitution, must be modified when we know that the liberty which they guarded so carefully was not the fundamental liberty of the individual. They were not interested in protecting the individual against the tyranny of the majority in a democracy.

"We have no ancient liberties." What liberty we have is that allowed under the courts; for the constitution, and the bills of rights, both federal and state, are so indefinite in most cases that they have little meaning except for the interpretation of the courts. These courts rely upon the support of the majority public opinion and are therefore conservative. Consequently, minorities must constantly fight for liberty.

Libertarians do have many difficulties in America—vagueness in the definition of constitutional rights, popular ignorance of early traditions of freedom, the indifference of a public which is prospering under the status quo, and the conservatism and inconsistency of the courts—to say nothing of such guardians of "Americanism" as His Loyal Highness, the Lord Mayor of Chicago. Incidentally, if that Mayor is to do a thorough, hundred-per-cent job, he must not withhold from proscription two important documents unquestionably polluted by English sources—the constitutions of the United States and of Illinois.

ROSWELL P. BARNES.

[1] Published by the H. W. Wilson Co. $1.50.

New Governments of Eastern Europe

IN 1914 Europe counted 26 states if its five pigmy republics are included. In 1927 there were 34 (or 38 depending on the count in Russia). Of this number 19 are smaller in area than Honduras, and 24 (that is, two-thirds) have a smaller population than New York City. This cataclysmic change made it necessary to rewrite all books on political science that pertained to Europe.

Malbone W. Graham, Jr., has already contributed one excellent study to this stupendous task. He returns now with a second, *New Governments of Eastern Europe*. In this he "simply endeavors to portray concretely, scientifically, and entirely dispassionately the breakdown of the Romanov empire and the way in which its transformation into the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics and the Baltic states has been effected. Beginning with Russia, Graham follows through with Finland, Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and ends with Poland. The book closes with 200 pages of select documents illustrating the text.

Quite naturally the greatest interest attaches to the treatment of Russia. With propaganda flying fast and loose for years, what will a "dispassionate" study be able to say? The Russian chapter is fascinating, to say the least. Graham is no communist. He believes that the future of Russia lies in compromise with communism, since the success of the U. S. S. R., such as it is, is due to the N. E. P., the diluting of the strict communist program. Yet after critical examination of the recent years Graham makes the following two significant statements:

> "Under the bludgeonings of civil war and economic misfortune, and despite the vagaries of communistic ideology, Russia has found in practice, under the soviet government, a solution for the basic problems of her political reconstruction. What the Czarist government had eternally refused, what the provisional government had but lukewarmly promised, i. e., cultural autonomy and national self-determination, became, under soviet auspices and soviet forms, a living, poignant reality.
>
> "In a very real sense it may be said that the soviet union has established a stronger unit of economic life than had ever been created by the Czars; the very regional regrouping of the vast area under soviet control under scientifically ascertained needs and purposes will serve to accentuate the economic usefulness of the union aand enhance its powers, irrespective of the men at the helm or the minor fluctuations of internal policy."

The Balticum, in which he includes Poland, is dealt with at length as to form of government, political parties, and outstanding political events. Indeed, the layman is liable to be overwhelmed with the flood of detail, which makes this volume of 826 pages a small cyclopaedia for the countries and the time dealt with. Nevertheless there has been enough political experiment of importance in this corner of the world within the last few years

to justify the extended treatment, especially since there is a dearth of materials in this field. Poland, of course, commands attention for other reasons. In it are centered many of the gravest problems of present day Europe and the fears of all friends of peace.

Malbone Graham has done an admirable, even if perhaps too massive, a job. And by no means least are the chapters on Russia. (Published by Henry Holt & Co. $5.) H. C. E.

The Struggle in Mexico

A VERY excellent contribution is made by William English Walling in his *The Mexican Question* to "the development of a well-informed, aroused and sympathetic public opinion in this country." Certainly we are all agreed with him that such opinion is absolutely necessary if the people of the United States are, through Congress, to head off the armed intervention to which the Coolidge-Kellogg policy seems to be leading. There is a chance that our new embassador may change things, too.

Intelligent people want the essential facts on any situation, expressed briefly and in good perspective. Mr. Walling does just that concerning the program of the Calles administration which seeks to aid the 12,000,000 ex-peons, freed by the Revolution of 1910 and the Constitution of 1917, in regaining the lands taken from them by treachery and establishing themselves as independent farmers, and the 2,000,000 industrial workers in establishing the right to organize and secure legal protection against exploitation by foreign and native employers. He shows very clearly that these policies, sadly checked since January, 1927, by opposition without and within, grow out of the needs of the Mexican situation and not out of communistic theories imported from Moscow.

In Part III he discusses "the natural conflict of interest between Mexican nationalism and American capitalism" and "the possibility of a reasonable settlement and understanding," dealing frankly with the menace to the political-economic independence of all Latin-American countries involved in the White House Mexican policy and, of course, maintaining Mexico's fundamental right to make and interpret her own laws. (Published by The Robins Press, 112 Fourth Avenue, New York. $2.)

Amy Blanche Greene.

Getting and Spending

"PLAIN living and high thinking" is still the accepted theory for academic life, but the pressure to spend in conformity with other professional groups is playing havoc with the simple life according to *Getting and Spending at the Professional Standard of Living,* by Jessica Peixotto, a recent study of the income and expenditure of 96 faculty families at the University of California. The salary range was discovered to have been from $1,800 to $8,000, with an average of $3,000 for the whole group, which included all ranks from instructors to full professors. Ninety per cent received from $2,000 to $3,000. Total incomes were considerably larger, ranging from $1,800 to $16,000 with a median return of $4,800. Seventy-five per cent earned a supplementary income, largely from additional teaching and research, and 40 per cent had helpmates who earned. The size of the family averaged between three and four and 28 per cent were without children, but no particular relation was discovered between family numbers and income. Though the faculty person is no longer a cloistered celibate, it was obvious that as a class he is not aggressively seeking to make an appearance of material prosperity, as evidenced by the the fact that only fifty-five owned automobiles and the median cost of clothing per family was $440.33. The author concludes that $7,000, which was approximately the amount spent by full professors, is necessary to maintain a comfortable standard of living in academic circles, and unless measurably larger salaries are forthcoming the profession will be abandoned to less capable individuals. Does that conclusion mean persuading the ordinary citizen to pay salaries several times his own or increasing dependence on the bounty of rich men? (Published by the Macmillan Company. $2.25.) George L. Collins.

Cheap at Half the Price

CAN you beat it? One hundred and two pages for a nickel! And stuffed with meat from cover to cover. I am talking about *The Interallied Debts,* a pamphlet published by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 405 West 117th St., New York City. This is by all odds the best summary of the evidence available for the reduction of the war debts. While you are at it, you might send a quarter and become an annual subscriber to *International Conciliation,* of which this pamphlet is the May number, or a dollar and receive copies from now until the end of 1932. K. P.

Prosperity—Be-all, End-all

THE authors of "Money" and "Profits" have put into popular form the substance of their former books. The new title is *Business Without a Buyer,* by William Trufant Foster and Waddill Catchings. They are "practical" men, eschewing all "revolutionary measures"; their book shows one type of "progressive" conservatism. Production, they contend, does not automatically create the requisite demand. The remedy seems linked in some way with regular and sufficient construction of new factories, etc. "A simple, feasible, and immediate way out" is promised—in the author's next book. Much more evidence is needed to reckon intelligently the value of the various elements in the theory. Meanwhile the socially minded reader will feel that a sop of even everlasting prosperity is no substitute for justice. The book is worthwhile as a thoroughly good presentation of a conservative view. (Houghton Mifflin Company, 1927. $2.)

Patrick M. Malin

Borah, Fosdick, Steiner, et al

JEROME DAVIS is at it again. This time he has assembled twenty-four articles on various phases of *Christianity and Social Adventuring.* You cannot turn around in this book without tripping over a star. The list of contributors makes you think of a benefit performance for the family of a deceased actress. Even Who's Who can do no more than this: Senator Borah, Dr. Fosdick, Bishop McConnell, Dr. Lapp, Miriam Van Waters; Graham Taylor, "Sonny" Elliott, Dr. Cabot, Dr. Steiner, Dr. Mott—all under the personal direction of Dr. Davis. One woman contributor to twenty-three men is about the normal number chosen when the selection is made by one of the "stronger sex." The subjects treated include civic righteousness, jails, the sermon on the mount, immigrants, daily community life, the church and social questions, chambers of commerce, social settlements, juvenile delinquency, community recreation, settlement houses, the Catholic Church, the Y. M. C. A., health, education, etc. The second chapter alone is worth the price of admission. (Century Company, $2.50.) K. P.

Industrial Prosperity and the Farmer

THIS Institute of Economics study, by Russell C. Engberg, analyzes the effect of business cycles on the fortunes of our farmers. The author attacks the problem with economic theory and statistical analysis and shows that since the demand for food and clothing is relatively inelastic, the supply of farm products is by far the most important determinor of prices. His correlation analysis shows that for cotton, wheat, corn and hogs, the amount produced has from two to five times more influence on the prices of these crops than does the business cycle with its varying consumer purchasing power. The author believes that forecasts of business conditions and of changes in demand are not yet sufficiently accurate for farmers to use in planning their production programs. He also holds that flattening out the business cycles will not greatly benefit the farmer since his problem is to adjust production to demand. (Published by Macmillan. $2.50.)

GORDON H. WARD.

Van Loon on America

WE hope that this very readable book will stimulate a wider interest in American history and cause the majority of readers to search more widely and with curiosity before forming definite opinions upon the many debatable episodes treated by Van Loon. His new volume *America* lacks the individuality we expected. The larger episodes in our history are rather too acceptably treated. Recent research has thrown light on these events which might have influenced Van Loon's fundamental treatment. He is unconventional in his treatment of detail and always lucid, but we hoped for a more original handling of the political and historical background of our country. (Published by Boni and Liveright, $5.)

A. A. S.

Toynbee's Survey of 1925

AFTER completion of the monumental *History of the Peace Conference* the Royal Institute of International Affairs determined to publish each year a survey of world events. Under the supervision of Professor Arnold J. Toynbee there was issued last year the survey for 1924. Now there is in hand the *Survey of International Affairs. 1925. Vol. I. The Islamic World.* This not merely fills the gap left in last year's volume, but in some cases goes back as far as 1876. The countries covered include Turkey, Morocco, Egypt, Syria, Palestine, Iraq, India and Afghanistan. The volume is invaluable to editors, students of modern history and of the Moslem world. (Published by the Oxford University Press. 25s.)

H. C. E.

Especially for Christians

IN 1038 pages Professor George Foot Moore has packed a monumental history of *Judaism* in the first centuries of the Christian era. This study is not only indispensable to students but deserves wide reading at the hands of the general public. The average Christian, minister as well as layman, has an utterly distorted view of the religion of the Jews which was current in Jesus' day. Here is an aid to clear thinking. Professor Moore leans over backward in the effort to be fair and sympathetic in his treatment. He seems to have written especially for Christians. (Harvard University Press, 2 volumes, $10.)

K. P.

A Biography of Heinrich Heine

THE title, *That Man Heine,* chosen by Lewis Browne in collaboration with Elsa Weihl, is as fascinating as the biography. The authors have a passion for accuracy which is obvious throughout. Heine, the Düsseldorf Jew, with his constant sense of mental and spiritual exile from Germany is drawn with understanding. His wide range of prose writings, with their caustic qualities and incomparable humor are perhaps given a disproportionate amount of space. Mr. Browne has assumed, it seems, that we all know and appreciate Heine's lyric poetry. (Published by Macmillan, $3. Distributed by The Literary Guild.)

A. A. S.

The Bosses' Union

THE chief criticism that can be directed against *Company Unions* by Robert W. Dunn is that the book was not published sooner. The employers' publicity agents have endowed the euphemistically called "employee representation" schemes with the virtues of industrial democracy. Many a well-intentioned liberal has been won over by this kind of mouthing. Old-line trade union leaders, blatant but ignorant, with their uncritical talk about the coöperation of capital and labor, have had the wind taken out of their sails. What Dunn has accomplished has been to go beyond preambles, constitutions and press releases to discover what employee representation really is. He determines it is a brazen fraud. It can be nothing else in the absence of the economic power of the trade union. *Company Unions* by Robert W. Dunn itself constitutes an important element in the offensive against what intelligent workers like to refer to as the bosses' unions. (Vanguard Press, 50c.)

LOUIS STANLEY.

ITS register of over 4,000 ex-students gives only a hint of the spread of the School's influence. The list includes, of course, influential social workers in a long catalog of communities throughout the United States. The past four years have added eighty-one students from thirty-one foreign countries. The graduate roll numbers fifteen foreign alumni from Canada, the Philippine Islands, India, Japan, Turkey, Roumania, France and Russia.

The New York School of Social Work
113 East Twenty-second Street
New York

Barnum's Autobiography

"THE chief aim has been to present Barnum's own story as he himself first set it down, without regard to the qualms and tremors of respectability which gradually overcame the franker side of his nature," says Waldo R. Browne, the editor of this new edition of *Barnum's Own Story*. Much of the material of the first edition, 1855, has been kept (Barnum destroyed the plates of this edition fourteen years later and rewrote his life, suppressing and refurbishing pompously). The merely trivial, anad the tedious documentation has been cut. The book that emerges is a charmingly naive and boastful record of Barnum's fun in fooling the public. He gloried in it, and was constantly entertained by the gullibility he exploited so shrewdly. It is good-natured, very amusing, and keen commentary on the human mind. If Barnum had had a political will-to-power complex, God help our ancestors! But practical joking was much more fun. (Published by The Viking Press, Inc. $3.)

COLEY B. TAYLOR.

Community Church Educational Department
presents
JOHN FARRAR
in a course of four lectures on
"Sidelights On Contemporary Literature"
Nov. 24—"New Women Writers"
Dec. 1 —"The Literature of Futility"
Dec. 8 —"The Literature of Propaganda"
Dec. 15—"The Religious Angle on Current Literature"
COMMUNITY CHURCH AUDITORIUM
Park Avenue and 34th Street
75c for a single Lecture—$2.50 for the course of 4 Lectures

SCATTERED SEEDS
An illustrated Monthly Magazine for Children, published under the care of the Race Street branch of Friends. Send 75c for one year's subscription to SCATTERED SEEDS, Dept. W. 154 No. 15th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

THE DUANE PRESS
Printers of the Better Kind
46-48 New Chambers Street New York
Phone Beekman 0139

Send for Additional Copies of This Issue
Special Bundle Order Rates
12 Copies for $1.00
THE WORLD TOMORROW
52 Vanderbilt Ave. New York, N. Y.

BETTER BOOKS *for* ALL-ROUND READING

The Historical Life of Christ, by J. Warschauer. New York: Macmillan. 1926. 6 x 9. 368 pages. $5. An interpretation by a scholar who believes that Jesus deliberately sought crucifixion as the means of ushering in the Kingdom of God.

Jesus, by Henri Barbusse. New York: Macaulay, 1927. 6 x 9. 235 pages. $2.50. If you are looking for fantasy, not fact: literature, not history,—here it is.

The ABC of Art, by John Haldane Blackie. New York: Vanguard Press, 1927. 4¼ x 7. 162 pages. $0.50. A brief, readable introduction to the arts, not omitting the "lively" ones—jazz and the movies. Necessarily somewhat sketchy, but nevertheless helpful to the novice in appreciation, and suggestive occasionally even to the hardened devotee.

The House of Lost Identity, by Donald Corley. New York: McBride. 1927. 324 pages. 5½ x 8½. $2.50. The house is No. 17 Flicker Street, New York City. The key is a wish. If you force the door, you will find cobwebs and bare walls, but if you have the key, you walk right in to adventures as fantastic and whimsical as they are delightfully told.

Adult Education vs. Workers' Education, edited by a committee of Local No. 189 of the American Federation of Teachers. Katonah, N. Y.: Brookwood Labor College. 1927. 5½ x 7¾. 95 pages. (Pamphlet) $.50. Addresses and discussion at the Fourth Annual Conference of Teachers in Workers' Education. Stimulating, enlightening, if inevitably a bit chaotic.

My Eighty Years, by Charles F. Dole. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co. 1927. 469 pages. 5¾ x 8½. $5. The intimate record of an unusual mind, minister, and public servant: in which the President of the Association to Abolish War recounts his interpretation of the events of many years and affirms his present-day philosophy.

Foundations of World Unity, by 'Abdu'l Bahá. New York: World Unity Pub. Corp., 122 E. 34th St. 1927. 112 pages. 6 x 9. (Pamphlet) $.80. A compilation from the writing and addresses of a great teacher of the oneness of mankind.

Are the Filipinos Ready for Independence? Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science. 1927. 6½ x 9¾. 33 pages. (Pamphlet) $2. Articles by that demon investigator, the Hon. Carmi Thompson; Pedro Gulvara, resident commissioner from the P. I.; and others. A valuable and predominantly pro-independence symposium.

Symposium on War, compiled by John Horsch. Scottdale, Pa.: Mennonite Pub. House. 1927. 5¼ x 7¾. 44 pages. (Pamphlet) 10c. An unusually tasty collection of quotations on war and peace from just about everybody.

PROGRESSIVE SCHOOLS

Alabama

SCHOOL OF ORGANIC EDUCATION
Fairhope, Ala.
For boys and girls from kindergarten to College. Boarding and day school. Under the direction of Marietta Johnson.

Arizona

THE PHOENIX SCHOOL
Day and boarding school for boys and girls. Unique in its western setting. Address D. H. Markham, M.A., Director, 2838 North 7 Street. September to April. May-August Maricham Camp, Ozark Mts., Fayetteville, Arkansas.

Illinois

THE JUNIOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
Downer's Grove, Ill.
Write Miss Lucia Burton Morse.

Maryland

CHEVY CHASE COUNTRY DAY SCHOOL
Write Mr. Stanwood Cobb, 17 Grafton St., Chevy Chase, Md. Particular attention to gifted children. Special boarding department for pre-adolescent children.

New Jersey

THE CITY AND COUNTRY SCHOOL
165 West 12th St., New York City
Experimental in practice. Write to Miss Caroline Pratt.

SAINT JOHN'S SCHOOL
(Non-Sectarian)
Boulevard and Tower Hill Road
Mountain Lakes, New Jersey
Write Theresa L. Wilson, or Ruth A. McClure, Principals.

New York

LOCUST FARM SCHOOL
Poughquag, N. Y. (Dutchess County).
For younger boys and girls.
Summer Camp, June 1st to October 1st.
Write Clarinda C. Richards.

MANUMIT SCHOOL
Write Henry R. Linville, Pawling, Dutchess Co., N. Y. A country school for the children of workers and liberals; coeducational, experimental, grammar school to college.

MOHEGAN MODERN SCHOOL
Mohegan Colony, Crompond Road, Peekskill, N. Y. Coeducational. Special attention to creative work. Have a few vacancies for boarding pupils.
Write Jas. H. Dick.

Pennsylvania

OAK LANE COUNTRY DAY SCHOOL
of Philadelphia.
A progressive school for boys and girls from kindergarten to college. Write Francis M. Froelicher, Headmaster.

WORKERS FOR PEACE

INTERNATIONAL

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM,
U. S. Headquarters, 522-17th St., N.W., Washington, D. C.
New York State Branch, 414 Bible House, Astor Place, N. Y.
An International Organization with 25 National Sections pursuing a common program to end war through world organization for social, political and economic co-operation. International President, Jane Addams; National Chairman, Hannah Clothier Hull; Executive Secretary, Dorothy Detzer.

WORLD ALLIANCE FOR INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES,
70 Fifth Ave., New York City.
To organize the religions of the world to the end that the spirit of good-will may prevail and international peace be established. Pres., William P. Merrill; Gen. Sec., Henry A. Atkinson; Chairman Exec. Com., Frei B. Smith; Educational Sec., Frederick Lynch; Extension Sec., Linley V. Gordon; Field Sec., Harry N. Holmes.

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION
(Incorporated July 12, 1910)
40 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass.
Publishes World Peace Foundation Pamphlets, documented brochures on international questions; information service; American agents for publications of League of Nations, International Labor Office and Permanent Court of International Justice. Raymond T. Rich, Gen. Sec.; Denys P. Myers, Cor. Sec.

SOCIETY TO ELIMINATE ECONOMIC CAUSES OF WAR
Wellesley, Mass.
As economic barriers between nations are abolished and more equal opportunities to all races extended, armaments will automatically reduce and wars cease.—Leonard W. Cronkite, President.

NATIONAL

AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE,
20 South 12th St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Where the need is greatest, to demonstrate the "Better Way" by practical Christian service. —Ex. Sec., Wilbur K. Thomas.

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION,
Youth Section (formerly The Fellowship of Youth for Peace)
383 Bible House, Astor Pl., N. Y. C.
Uniting people of many lands who are committed to a way of life creative of fellowship and unity, who therefore repudiate war, exploitation and racial discrimination. Secretaries: Paul Jones, Nevin Sayre, George Collins. *Youth Section.* Howard Kester, Secretary.

PEACE AND SERVICE COMMITTEE, Philadelphia.
Yearly Meeting of Friends (Race St.)
Represents a Religious Society which adds to an historic stand against the whole war system, a present-day concern for saving a civilization from militarism and imperialism. This concern is one aspect of our faith in the brotherhood of man, dependent on a Divine Father.

WAR RESISTERS LEAGUE,
260 West 11th Street, New York City.
Unites men and women of all shades of religious, social and political belief who have determined to give no support to any war.—Anna N. Davis, Acting Secretary.

Special Christmas Offer
of
THE WORLD TOMORROW

We suggest that you send THE WORLD TOMORROW to your friends as a Christmas Gift. The special price of 8 months for $1.00 makes it possible to send the magazine to several people. We will furnish an attractive card announcing your gift which you may send to reach your friends at Christmas time. It is not too early to begin your Christmas plans and ordering.

THE WORLD TOMORROW
52 Vanderbilt Ave. New York City

NATIONAL

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR PREVENTION OF WAR,
532 17th St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
Clearinghouse publishing valuable monthly Bulletin (25c a year); "America First" co-operation posters; educational goodwill material for teachers and schools. Samples sent on request. Ex. Sec. Frederick J. Libby.

LABOR PRESS

ADVANCE, THE (weekly) $2.00
Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. 31 Union Sq., N. Y. C. Joseph Schlossberg, ed.

JEWISH DAILY FORWARD (daily)
Endorsed by Socialist Party, United Hebrew Trades, Workmen's Circle. Forward Assoc., 175 E. Broadway, N. Y. C. Abraham Cahan, ed.

LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS' JOURNAL (monthly) $1.50
Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 806 Engineers' Bldg., Cleveland, Ohio.

ONE BIG UNION BULLETIN (weekly) $2.50
Canada's greatest labor paper. 54 Adelaide St., Winnipeg, Man., Canada. T. E. Moore, ed.

Please remember

RENEWALS
or
CHANGE OF ADDRESSES

should reach us by the 1st of the month to be entered for the following issue.

THE WORLD TOMORROW
52 Vanderbilt Avenue New York City

ASSOCIATION PRESS

Recommends these books to those who read thoughtfully

The Process of Group Thinking $3.00

By **Harrison S. Elliott,** *Professor, and Head of the Department of Religious Education, Union Theological Seminary.*

A complete treatment of the philosophy and method of voluntary group discussions.

Experimentation and Measurement in Religious Education

By **Goodwin B. Watson** $3.75

A detailed handbook prepared to meet the needs of those who wish to secure a comprehensive understanding of the new methods now in use in religious education.

The "Everyday Life" Books

By **Harry Emerson Fosdick**

Meaning of Faith	$1.35
Meaning of Prayer	1.15
Meaning of Service	1.25

Write for complete list in our Fall Catalogue

347 Madison Avenue
New York City

To Clear Your Ideas on Social and Economic Problems of the Day

Read

SOCIAL FORCES

Edited by Howard W. Odum, Jesse F. Steiner and Gerald W. Johnson

A few only of the many interesting discussions reserved for immediate publication are: *The South and the New Society,* by Walter Lippmann; *Eleven Questions Concerning American Marriage,* by William F. Ogburn; *The Development and Present Tendencies of Sociology in Argentine,* by L. L. Bernard; *Farmer Leaders of the U. S.,* by P. A. Sorokin and C. C. Zimmerman; *Marriage and Family Relations,* by Ernest R. Groves.

Published quarterly, in September, December, March, and June.

$4.00 a year

The Williams & Wilkins Company
Publishers
Mt. Royal and Guilford Aves.,
Baltimore, Maryland

CORRESPONDENCE

Teamwork Between Two Worlds

BY personal experience I have tested Mr. Sayre's belief that there is teamwork between the world of the visible and of invisibility, cooperation between the living on earth and the living beyond our mortal sight.

In May the dearest friend I have ever known died quite suddenly—I was with her in New York—we thought the operation was going to be a success—but it wasn't and she died the fourth day afterwards. The abyss was pretty deep all around me, and the narrow plank that bridged it was very insecure at times. She did not leave me comfortless, and I escaped the abyss.

The doctors had ordered two months' vacation before she died. I had it in the country, much alone. It was one of the most strangely happy summers I ever spent and I probably learned and experienced more than in any other decade of my life—in the three months following her death I mean.

Mr. Sayre's article brought me much joy. It is good to have one confess faith in a genuine touch between seen and unseen. Most of us are afraid to say what we believe about spiritual communion for people might think us a bit queer. So we bury within ourselves the most beautiful experiences, afraid they will be misunderstood or that criticism may tarnish them. Perhaps we are putting our light under a bushel. It may be that many people are longing to know the validity of their own experiences, to test them by comparison with the experiences of others; are hungering for some assurance that will let them believe what has come to them is reality and not delusion born of desperate need.

For ten years I have known from what befell me that teamwork between persons in what we call "heaven" and "earth" is possible. I had known for many more years than ten that there must be truth in the belief that spirits in a human body and spirits in a more ethereal body find it possible to bridge the gap of silence and invisibility and hold happy communion one with the other. But it took the sudden death of a saintly and beloved mother to translate this intellectual conviction into a living experience in which feeling, intelligence and will all played an active part. Of those more obvious evidences of survival, of constant love and thought on the part of those gone ahead, it is not necessary to speak. Only those who have similar experiences will believe, and they do not need proof—they *know.* And it is not the sudden transcendence of normal life which is important, but the cultivation of an attitude of mind and heart which keeps an open channel between ourselves and the living "dead."

We can if we choose keep such open doors to those who are gone and who are bound to us by ties of love and common interest that we have with them a sort of swift telegraphic communication. Or a better illustration might be that we are lifted together in the ocean of life and spiritually flow together. Probably both illustrations are true and describe quite different experiences, for sometimes the sense of togetherness comes in sudden flashes, sometimes like the lifting of an ocean tide in which we meet in the most profound sense.

When we practice "presence" with our dead we become aware that, beautiful and important a part as memory plays in keeping them real to us, there is something far more vivid and vital than memory, something living, creative, fluid, ever passing between our comrades there and ourselves here. We no longer dream

y of reunion beyond the world of space-time, we find unity here
l now. We have "treasure in heaven" and we deliberately set
work to cultivate in our souls a technique of living which will
able us to live consciously where our treasure is. We dimly
ceive stretching above us into infinity, story beyond story, the
her reaches of our own being, and we set mind and will to
rk to begin to live in at least a higher story than we have
r known before.

Life has a new orientation, but life also becomes more prac-
al in the long range meaning of what is practical. Living
re conscious of our spiritual heritage does not mean losing
erest in doing our bit towards the building of the Kingdom
earth. We see life as more whole and beautiful, but we also
how infinitely far are ourselves and our fellow men from
ving the Kingdom within us. With a new and steadier faith
put our hands to the task, willing to give all that we have
it, and realizing that only as we give can we have. Nothing
irreparable, yet everything is important, and we begin to see
at are those first things which should be put first.

And those others who have laid down their work here, some-
nes in the fullness and vigor of their powers—do some of
em hunger for human lives through which they can continue
pour love and service into a chaotic and struggling world?
r many of them is their own growth best achieved by continuing
work for the Kingdom through human channels? Are they
ger to go on with chosen interests through cooperation with
man hearts and brains and wills? Personally, I believe there
rejoicing in "heaven" when a human life is open to this truth
l ready to cooperate with spiritual forces generated by those
ind the veil.

Cooperation does not mean domination, any more than we are
minated by a working partner here. There is no question of
ssive acceptance of influences beyond our control. It behooves
to keep our intelligence as keen, our will as strong, our hearts
steady when cooperating with dear comrades now invisible, as
en we worked together on earth sharing ideas and ideals. Pur-
seful working together is a part of teamwork between the
rlds. There are periods of quiet, of in-gathering of power,
consciously seeking the higher levels of our being where that
er may come in to us, but they are directed by mind and will.
Sometimes I wonder if even one or two lives on earth cannot
en many channels of influence to a beloved comrade gone on.
hink of them with increasing manifoldness in that spiritual life,
th power to enter many, many lives—yet one or two on earth
y provide the open door. But it is better far if many people
e willing to practice this sort of spiritual teamwork. I have
most dear comrade there, who is infinite in quality, and I am
t content to be the single channel through which she goes on
th her work—I wish for her many conscious human cooperators
that nothing she has to give shall be lost.

"I will not leave you comfortless; I will come to you." Words
h and deep with meaning for countless followers of the Christ
wn through the ages. But I wonder if when Jesus was so
wly gone, the disciples did not remember those words of His
ken that last night and find in them friendly, sweet, comfort-
assurance. Today when we have lost a friend who showed
something of the spirit of Jesus, the old words ring with fresh
aning—"I will not leave you comfortless; I will come to you."
d through the beloved comrade we find anew our stumbling
y to God and man.

Richmond, Va. LUCY R. MASON.

For Better Homes

$2,000,000
City Housing Corporation

15-Year 6% Mortgage Collateral Trust Sinking Fund Bonds Due July 1, 1942

Direct obligation of the City Housing Corporation, with Capital Stock (fully paid) and Surplus more than $2,375,000, and secured under Trust agreement by Second Mortgages aggregating 120% or marketable securities aggregating 100% of the face amount of the bonds outstanding. Denominations of $100 or any multiple thereof, interest payable January 1st-July 1st.

American Exchange Irving Trust Company, Trustee

A sinking fund is provided for, beginning in January, 1932, calculated to retire 40% of this issue by maturity

For Better Housing

These bonds offer the opportunity of investing in a sound 6% bond amply secured by a large number of small mortgages. They should appeal to many investors, and especially those desirous of participating in the providing of better housing for families of moderate incomes. $1,200 worth of second mortgages on Sunnyside homes will secure every $1,000 of bonds outstanding.

Bonds are the direct obligation of City Housing Corporation with Capital and Surplus of over $2,375,000, and with assets, after giving effect to this issue, of $4,389,534. There will be over $2,194 in assets for each $1,000 in bonds issued.

The Corporation has constructed dwellings of an actual sales value, including land, of more than $7,000,000. Net earnings available for interest on these bonds for the years 1925 and 1926 have averaged $314,245 per year, as compared to the annual interest requirement on these bonds of $120,000. Interest requirement has thus been earned an average of more than 2.61 times per year.

Descriptive circular sent on request.

Priced at par, to yield 6%

(***Interest will begin from date of receipt of subscription payment***)

Subscriptions may be sent direct to

CITY HOUSING CORPORATION

A Limited Dividend Company—Organized to build better homes and communities.

587 Fifth Avenue New York City

Directors: Alexander M. Bing, *President*, Dr. Felix Adler, John G. Agar, Leo S. Bing, Charles S. Bird, Jr., William Sloane Coffin, *Vice-President*, Thomas C. Desmond, Douglas L. Elliman, Prof. Richard T. Ely, Arthur Lehman, Frank Lord, V. Everit Macy, John Martin, Mrs. Joseph M. Proskauer, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Robert E. Simon.

The Last Page

LIKE all other great personages, I receive a heavy mail. It is heavy, sometimes, less in avoirdupois than in humor. On occasion it is weighty from sheer cast-iron nerve. From one of these occasions I select the following:

> "Last year many of our Customers witnessed unusually big Holiday business by using Illustrated Christmas Lithographed Letterheads like this sample. We are, therefore sending a letter to you in order to acquaint you with its merits and enable you to put over your Holiday Sales Message or Good Will Greeting.
>
> "Observe the stock—how beautifully it typifies the Holiday Season * * * * They put your Holiday message across with great VIM, and are sure to win new trade * * * * They not only awaken the Holiday Spirit, but help move Holiday Merchandise.
>
> "Yours for Results,
> "————LETTER COMPANY."

Results, eh? Well, one result is that I have helped you sell nothing, my jolly pirates, unless yourselves. I'm about fed up with the Commercialization of Christmas. It's a far cry from sales promotion, profits, and "results," to the carpenter who drew a contrast between the way of Solomon in all his glory to the non-profit-seeking lilies. One might well say, of the commercializers, "Consider the sillies; they toil not, neither do they spin; they merely study how to break down Sales Resistance."

* * *

I'M a trifle weary, too, of wishes for a "prosperous New Year." My Christmas card to you all would read about like this:

CHRISTMAS GREETINGS

and Hearty Good Wishes
for the Coming Year

from

ECCENTRICUS

May the New Year not be too prosperous, thus to retain the zest of struggle, the comfort of sacrifice, and the sense of oneness with the toiling masses. May it not be too satisfying, thus to keep the eager desire to strive for justice and the abolition of misery and fear in the lives of the less favored. May it not be overfull of peace, thus to stir you to the fight for a warless world. And by the beginning of another year, may the new world be brought a little nearer—a world free of suspicion and wrong from nation toward nation and race toward race, a world worthy of the sturdy rebel and sublime prophet whose birth we celebrate.

* * *

THERE are standards of value in our civilization which perplex far wiser heads than mine. But about the wildest extravagance I can think of would be to exhibit a pecuniary interest in autographs, and in particular the autograph of Warren Gamaliel Harding. A dealer of my knowledge would be willing to sell a full autographed letter of the late President, written in 1919, for the neat little sum of $350,000. I'm afraid I'd never be a success as an autograph dealer. In the case of this particular celebrity and, for that matter, of his successor, I'd light my garbage incinerator with a million of their letters any day and find no slightest cause for grief.

And it is a fact, believe it or not, that for three dollars I recently bought a book on Capital Punishment bearing the authenticated autograph of William Lloyd Garrison, with the great crusader's characteristic marginal x's and parentheses around the more outspoken and more fact-meaty paragraphs!

Such is our civilization, mesdames and messieurs, in the year of our Great Comrade, 1927.

* * *

THERE'S no satisfying some people. Hanford MacNider, for example. At Milwaukee, the place that used to be famous for another kind of effervescence, he said: "One can grow impatient with those who cheer Russia on with her Red Army of nearly a million men and at the same time scream that we are militarizing America, because we send a few thousand boys to the Citizen's Military Training Camps each summer." Don't stop to quarrel with the somewhat ductile statistics, and don't get mad and exclaim, "Who does?" Just note that one word *scream.*

However, don't agree to speak more softly—not just yet. For the Assistant Secretary of War said also a moment later: "Let us leave these native yellows and their whisperings at the mercy of the sound common sense of the American people." Now dear, good, kind, sweet Mr. MacNider, won't you please forgive us? We promise never, never to scream and whisper again. Anyhow, not at one and the same time.

* * *

I HEAR general exclamation over the consummate audacity of Mr. Clement Wood for writing a book on *The Outline of Man's Knowledge* and getting it all in 700 pages. Now I am not a cynic, and I, too, wonder that the job didn't take 710 pages at the very least. But what I'd like to see is a book on *The Outline of Man's Wisdom.* I'll bet my feline's worn catnip mouse against a genuine Harding autograph that it could all be put in a 100-page duodecimo.

The real trouble isn't that we have failed to learn new ways in five million years, but that we have unlearned so little in all that time. If I believed in endowments, I'd be willing, even if unable, to endow a few first-rate, high-speed institutions of unlearning.

ECCENTRICUS

Great Portraits of Little People

VII

The intellectual who dislikes conferences, discussion groups, and a co-operative search for truth, because it is all a needless waste of time.

THE WORLD OUTLOOK

A HUMANITY molded by ages of physical struggle has suddenly been compelled to deal with a new world of mental and spiritual powers. Every human faculty and social institution is now involved in a process of re-adaptation which no agency can check and the final result of which no one can foretell.

Greater in their implications than the battles of the World War are these strifes in the boundless theatre of mind and heart which from day to day signalize the world's progress toward the New Age.

In *World Unity Magazine* a number of independent students, representing different races, nations and religions, are describing important aspects of this universal transition. Whatever books or magazines you are now reading, you will find in *World Unity Magazine* a distinctive approach to the fundamental issues confronting this generation.

DEPARTMENTS

THE WISDOM OF THE AGES—Excerpts from the Sacred Scriptures of all Religions, with interpretative text by Mr. Alfred W. Martin. This department is equivalent to a course on the fundamentals of Comparative Religion.
THE NEW HUMANITY—An anthology of the world's greatest poems revealing the aspiration for brotherhood and peace, chosen and edited by Mary Siegrist.
THE RISING TIDE—A book review department dealing only with the major trends in current philosophy, science, ethics and religion, conducted by Prof. J. H. Randall, Jr.

SPECIAL FEATURES

Six articles on Science and Religion, by Kirtley F. Mather, Department of Geology, Harvard University. This series runs from October, 1927 to March, 1928.
Six articles on the Interaction of Asia and the West, by Wm. R. Shepherd, Seth Low Professor of History, Columbia University. This series begins in December, 1927.

Twelve articles on the great world leaders of the movement toward International Peace: David Starr Jordan, Léon Bourgeois, Bertha von Suttner, Norman Angell, Alfred H. Fried, Jane Addams, Romain Rolland, Emily Hobhouse, Edwin Morel, Jean Jaurès, Hamilton Holt, 'Abdu'l-Baha. The first appeared in October.

Subscribe to *World Unity Magazine* and bring it to the attention of your friends.

WORLD UNITY PUBLISHING CORPORATION,
4 EAST 12TH STREET, NEW YORK.

Please enter my subscription to World Unity Magazine. I enclose $3.50. (In Canada, $4.00; other countries, $4.50.)

_____

_____

_____

DECEMBER SURVEY

GRAPHIC

ARE FAMILIES WORTH the FUSS?

THE INDESTRUCTIBLE FAMILY

Dorothy Canfield Fisher — Louis I. Dublin
A. J. Muste — Mary Edna McChristie
Neva R. Deardorff — H. S. Jennings
W. F. Ogburn — Mary Willcox Glenn
Eleanor Rowland Wembridge — Jessie Taft
Rufus M. Jones — Frank J. Bruno
Frederick M. Eliot — Gordon Hamilton
Ernest R. Groves

THE HOME HAS LOST ITS HALO

50 cents a copy | DECEMBER, 1927 | $3.00 a year

FREE This special 50c. number with a year's subscription at the introductory rate of $2 (ordinarily $3).

Another special number coming on:
The Adventure of Growing Up

SURVEY GRAPHIC, 112 East 19th Street, New York, N. Y.
Send me the Family Life Number *free* and enter me for all of 1928. I enclose $2 (special price).

Name.....

Address.....

WT12

Date Due